

The
American Historical Review

AN UNDEVELOPED FUNCTION¹

"History is past Politics, and Politics are present History."—*Edward A. Freeman*.

"Politics are vulgar when they are not liberalized by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relation to practical politics."—*Sir John Seeley*.

HERE are aphorisms from two writers, both justly distinguished in the field of modern historical research. Sententious utterances, they would probably, like most sententious utterances, go to pieces to a greater or less extent under the test of severe analysis. They will, however, now serve me sufficiently well as texts.

That politics should find no place at its meetings is, I believe, the unwritten law of this Association; and by politics I refer to the discussion of those questions of public conduct and policy for the time being uppermost in the mind of the community. Taking into consideration the character and purpose of our body, and the broad basis on which its somewhat loose membership rests, the rule may be salutary. But there are not many general propositions not open to debate; and so I propose on this occasion to call this unwritten law of ours in question. While so doing, moreover, I shall distinctly impinge upon it.

Let us come at once to the point. May it not be possible that the unwritten law, perhaps it would be better to speak of it as the tacit understanding, I have referred to, admits of limitations and exceptions both useful and desirable? Is it, after all, necessary, or from a point of large view even well-considered, thus to exclude from the list of topics to be discussed at meetings of historical associations, and especially of this Association, the problems at the time uppermost in men's thoughts? Do we not, indeed, by so doing abdicate a useful public function, surrender an educational office? Do we not practically admit that we cannot trust ourselves to dis-

¹ President's address before the American Historical Association, December 27, 1901.

cuss political issues in a scholarly and historical spirit? In one word, are not those composing a body of this sort under a species of obligation, in a community like ours, to contribute their share, from the point of view they occupy, to the better understanding of the questions in active political debate? This proposition, as I have said, I now propose to discuss; and, in so doing, I shall, for purposes of illustration, draw freely on present practical politics, using as object lessons the issues now, or very recently, agitating the minds of not a few of those composing this audience,—indeed, I hope, of all.

I start from a fundamental proposition. The American Historical Association, like all other associations, whether similar in character or not, either exists for a purpose, or it had better cease to be. That purpose is, presumably, to do the best and most effective work in its power in the historical field. I then next, and with much confidence, submit that the standard of American political discussion is not now so high that its further elevation is either undesirable or impracticable. On the contrary, while, comparatively speaking, it ranks well both in tone and conduct, yet its deficiencies are many and obvious. That, taken as a whole, it is of a lower grade now than formerly, I do not assert; though I do assert, and propose presently to show, that in recent years it has been markedly lower than it was in some periods of the past, and periods within my own recollection. That, however, it is not so high as it should be, that it is by no manner of means ideal, all will, I think, admit. If so, that admission will suffice for present purposes.

My next contention is perhaps more open to dispute. It is a favorite theory now with a certain class of philosophers, somewhat inclined to the happy-go-lucky school, that in all things every community gets about what it asks for and is qualified to appreciate. In political discussion—as in railroad or hotel service, and in literature or religion—the supply as respects both quality and quantity responds with sufficient closeness to the demand. There is, however, good reason for thinking that, with the American community or at least with some sections and elements thereof, this at best specious theory does not at the present time hold true. Our recent political debates have, I submit, been conducted on a level distinctly below the intelligence of the constituency; the participants in the debate have not been equal to the occasion offered them. Evidence of this is found in the absence of response. I think I am justified in the assertion that no recent political utterance has produced a real echo, much less a reverberation; and it would not

probably be rash to challenge an immediate reference to a single speech, or pointed expression even, which during the last presidential campaign, for instance, impressed itself on the public memory. That campaign, seen through the vista of a twelve-month, was, on the contrary, from beginning to end, with a single exception, creditable neither to the parties conducting it, nor to the audience to whose level it was presumably gauged.

Perhaps, however, I can best illustrate what I have to say—enforce the lesson I would fain this evening teach—by approaching it through retrospect. So doing, also, if there is any skill in my treatment, I cannot well be otherwise than interesting; for I shall largely deal with events within the easy recollection of those yet in middle life. But, while those events are sufficiently removed from us to admit of the necessary perspective, having assumed their true proportions to what preceded and has followed, they have an advantage over the occurrences of a year ago; for the controversial embers of 1900 may still be glowing in 1901,—though, I must say, to me the ashes seem white and cold and dead enough. Still, I do not propose to go back to any very remote period, and I shall confine myself to my own recollection, speaking of that only of which I know, and in which I took part. My review will begin with the year 1856,—the year of my graduation, and that in which I cast my first vote; also one in which a President was chosen, James Buchanan being the successful candidate.

But it must be premised that each election does not represent a debate; not infrequently it is merely a stage in a debate. It was so in 1856; it has been so several times since. Indeed, since 1840,—the famous "Log Cabin and Hard Cider" campaign of "Coon-Skin Caps," and "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," probably the most humorous, not to say grotesque, episode in our whole national history, that in which the plane of discussion reached its lowest recorded level,—since 1840 there have been only six real debates, the average period of a debate being, therefore, ten years. These debates were, (1) that over Slavery, from 1844 to 1864; (2) that over Reconstruction, from 1868 to 1872; (3) Legal Tenders, or "Fiat Money," and Resumption of Specie Payments were the issues in 1876 and 1880; (4) the issue of 1888 and 1892 was over Protection and Free Trade; (5) the debate over Bimetallism and the Demonetization of Silver occurred in 1896; and, finally, (6) Imperialism, as it is called, came to the front in 1900. Since 1856, therefore, the field of discussion has been wide and diversified, presenting several issues of great moment. Of necessity also the debates have assumed many and diverse aspects, ethical, ethnolog-

ical, legal, military, economical, financial, historical. The last is that which interests us.

The first of the debates I have enumerated, that involving the slavery issue, is now far removed. We can pass upon it historically; for the young man who threw his maiden vote in 1860, when it came to its close, is now nearing his grand climacteric. Of all the debates in our national history that was the longest, the most elevated, the most momentous, and the best sustained. It looms up in memory; it projects itself from history. As a whole, it was immensely creditable to the people, the community at large, for whose instruction it was conducted. It has left a literature of its own, economical, legal, moral, political, imaginative. In fiction, it produced *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, still, if one can judge by the test of demand at the desks of our public libraries, one of the most popular books in the English tongue. In the law, it rose to the height of the Dred Scott decision; and, while the rulings in that case laid down have since been reversed, it will not be denied that the discussion of constitutional principles involved, whether at the bar, in the halls of legislatures, in the columns of the press or on the rostrum, was intelligent, of an order extraordinarily high, and of a very sustained interest. It was to the utmost degree educational.

So far as the historical aspect of that great debate is concerned, two things are to be specially noted. In the first place the moral and economical aspects predominated; and, in the second place, what may be called the historical element as an influencing factor was then in its infancy. Neither in this country nor in Europe had that factor been organized, as it now is. The slavery debate was so long and intense that all the forces then existing were drawn into it. The pulpit, for instance, participated actively. The physiologist was much concerned over ethnological problems, trying to decide whether the African was a human being or an animal; and, if the former, was he of the family of Cain. Thus all contributed to the discussion; and yet I am unable to point out any distinctly historical contribution of a high order; though, on both sides, the issue was discussed historically with intelligence and research. Especially was this the case in the arguments made before the courts and in the scriptural dissertations; while on the political side, the speeches of Seward and Sumner, of Jefferson Davis and A. H. Stevens, leave little to be desired. The climax was, perhaps, reached in the memorable joint debate between Lincoln and Douglas, of which it is not too much to say the country was the auditory. The whole constituted a fit prologue to the great struggle which ensued.

Beginning in its closing stage, in December, 1853, when the measure repealing the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was introduced into the Senate of the United States, and closing in December, 1860, with the passage of its Ordinance of Secession by South Carolina, this debate was continuous for seven years, covering two presidential elections, those of 1856 and 1860. So far as I know, it was *sui generis*; for it would, I fancy, be useless to look for anything with which to institute a comparison except in the history of Great Britain. Even there the discussion which preceded the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832, or that which led up to the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, or, finally, the Irish Home Rule agitation between 1871 and 1892, one and all sink into insignificance beside it. Of the great slavery debate it may then in fine be said that, while the study of history and the lessons to be deduced from history contributed not much to it, it made history, and on history has left a permanent mark.

Of the canvass of 1864, from our point of view little need be said. There was in it no great field for the historical investigator, the issue then presented to the people being of a character altogether exceptional. The result depended less on argument than on the outcome of operations in the field. There was, I presume, during August and September of that year, a wordy debate, but the people were too intent on Sherman as he circumvented Atlanta, and on Sheridan as he sent Early whirling up the valley of the Shenandoah, to give much ear to it. Had this Association then been in existence, and devoted all its energies to elucidating the questions at issue, I cannot pretend to think it would perceptibly have affected the result.

Nor was it greatly otherwise in the canvass of 1868. The country was then stirred to its very depths over the questions growing out of the war. The shattered Union was to be reconstructed; the slave system was to be eradicated. These were great political problems; problems as pressing as they were momentous. For their proper solution it was above all else necessary that they should be approached in a calm, scholarly spirit, observant of the teachings of history. Never was there a greater occasion; rarely has one been so completely lost. The assassination of Lincoln silenced reason; and to reason, and to reason only, does history make its appeal. The unfortunate personality of Andrew Johnson now intruded itself; and, almost at once, what should have been a calm debate degenerated into a furious wrangle. Looking back over the canvass of 1868, and excepting Gen. Grant's singularly felicitous closing of his brief letter of acceptance—"Let us have peace!"—I think it would be difficult for any one to recall a single

utterance which produced any lasting impression. The name even of the candidate nominated in opposition to Grant is not readily recalled. In that canvass, as in the preceding one, I should say there was no room for the economist, the philosopher, or the historian. The country had, for the time being, cut loose from both principle and precedent.

The debate over Reconstruction, begun in 1865, did not wear itself out until 1876. In no respect will it bear comparison with the debate over slavery which preceded it. Sufficiently momentous, it was less sustained, less thorough, far less judicial. Towards its close, moreover, as the country wearied, it was gravely complicated by a new issue; for, in 1867, began that currency discussion destined to last in its various phases through the life-time of a generation. It thereafter entered, in greater or less degree, into no less than nine consecutive presidential elections, two of which, those of 1876 and 1896, actually turned upon it.

The currency debate presented three distinct phases: first, the proposition, broached in 1867, known as the greenback theory, under which the interest-bearing bonds of the United States, issued during the Rebellion, were to be paid at maturity in United States legal tender notes, bearing no interest at all. This somewhat amazing proposition was speedily disposed of; for, early in 1869, an act was passed declaring the bonds payable "in coin." But, as was sure to be the case, the so-called "Fiat Money" delusion had obtained a firm lodgment in the minds of a large part of the community, and to drive it out was the work of time. It assumed, too, all sorts of aspects. Dispelled in one form, it appeared in another. When, for instance, the act of 1860 settled the question as respects the redemption of the bonds, the financial crisis of 1873 re-opened it by creating an almost irresistible popular demand for a government paper currency as a permanent substitute for specie. Finally, when seven years later this issue was put to rest by a return to specie payments, the over-production of silver, as compared with gold, already foreshadowed the rise of one of the most serious and far-reaching questions which have perplexed modern times. Thus as the ethical and legal issues which were the staples of public discussion from 1844 to 1872 were disposed of, or by degrees settled themselves, a series of material questions arose, destined, even if at times in a somewhat languid way, to occupy public attention through thirty years.

It is difficult to say what the dividing issue of 1876 really was. The country was then slowly recovering from the business prostration which followed the collapse of 1873. The issues involved in

Reconstruction, if not disposed of, were clearly worn out, and to them the country would not respond, turning impatiently from their further discussion. Those issues might now settle themselves, or go unsettled; and, though that conclusion was reached thirty years ago, they are not settled yet. The living debate was over material questions, the cause of the prolonged business depression, and the remedy for it. The favorite specific was at first a recourse to paper money. The government printing-press was to be set in motion in place of the mint; and even hard-money Democrats of the Jacksonian school united with radical Republicans of the Reconstruction period in guaranteeing a resultant prosperity. Again the teachings of history were ignored. What, it was contemptuously exclaimed in the Senate, do we care for "abroad"! From this calamity the country had been saved by the veto of President Grant in 1874; and, the following year, an act was passed looking to the resumption of specie payments on the 1st of January, 1879. Seventeen years of suspension were then to close. Over this measure the parties nominally joined issue in 1876. The Republicans, nominating Governor Hayes, of Ohio, demanded the fulfilment of the promise; the Democrats, nominating Governor Tilden, of New York, insisted on the repeal of the law. Yet it was well understood that the candidate of the Democracy favored the policy of which the law in debate was the concrete expression. The contest was thus in reality one between the "ins" and the "outs." We all remember how it resulted, and the terrible strain to which our machinery of government was in consequence subjected. In the wrangle which ensued the material and business interests of the country recuperated in a natural way, just as had repeatedly been the case before, and more than once since; and the United States then entered on a new era of increased prosperity. This brought the paper money debate to a close. The issues presented had, in the course of events, settled themselves.

But not the less for that, in the canvass of 1876 a field of great political usefulness was opened up to the historical investigator; a field which, I submit, he failed adequately to develop. A public duty was left unperformed. It was in connection with what John Stuart Mill has in one of his *Essays and Dissertations* happily denominated "The Currency Juggle." From time immemorial to tamper with the established measures of value has been the constant practice of men of restless and unstable mind, honest or dishonest, whether rulers or aspirants to rule. History is replete with instances. To cite them was the function of the historical investigator; to marshal them, and bring them to bear on the sophistries

of the day was the business of the politician. A professorial discussion in a meeting of such an organization as this would then have been much to the point; and yet, curiously enough, a new historical precedent was about to be worked out. That was then to be done which had never been done before; a country which had gone to the length the United States had gone in the direction of "Fiat Money"—two-thirds of the way to repudiation—was actually to retrace its steps, and resume payments in specie at the former standards of value. History would have been searched in vain for a parallel experience.

The administration of President Hayes was curiously epochal. During it the so-called "carpet-bag governments" disappeared from the southern states; the country resumed payments in specie; and, on the 28th of February, 1878, Congress passed, over the veto of the President, an act renewing the coinage of silver dollars, the stoppage of which, five years before, constituted what was destined thereafter to be referred to as "the crime of 1873." This issue, however, matured slowly. Public men, having recourse to palliatives, temporized with it; and, through four presidential elections it lay dormant, except in so far as parties pledged themselves to action calculated, in the well-nigh idiotic formula of politicians, to "do something for silver." The canvasses of 1880 and 1884 are, therefore, devoid of historical interest. The first turned largely on the tariff; and yet, curiously enough, the single utterance in that debate which has left a mark on the public memory was the wonderful dictum of Gen. Hancock, the candidate of the defeated opposition, that the tariff was a local issue, which, a number of years before, had excited a good deal of interest in his native state of Pennsylvania. The gallant and picturesque soldier, metamorphosed into a political leader *pro hac vice*, simply harked back to the "Log Cabin" and "Coon-skin" campaign of 1840, when, a youth of sixteen, he was on his way to West Point.

Nor is the recollection of the debate of 1884 much more inspiring. It was a lively contest enough, under Grover Cleveland and James G. Blaine as opposing candidates, a struggle between the "outs" to get in and the "ins" not to go out. But a single formula connected with it comes echoing down the corridors of time, the alliterative "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" of the unfortunate Burchard. An interlude in the succession of great national debates, the canvass of 1884 called for no application of the lessons of history.

That of 1888, presenting at last an issue, rose to the dignity of debate. In his annual message of the previous December, the

President, in disregard of all precedent, had confined his attention not only to the tariff, but to a single feature in the tariff, the duty on wool. In so doing he had, as the well-understood candidate of his party for re-election, flung down the gauntlet; for, only three years before, the Republicans, in the presidential platform, had laid particular emphasis on "the importance of sheep industry" and "the danger threatening its future prosperity." They had thus pledged themselves to "do something" for wool, as well as for silver, and the President now struck at wool as "the tariff-arch keystone." But, while in this debate the economist came to the front, there was no pronounced call and, indeed, small opportunity for the historian. The silver issue was in abeyance; the pension list and civil service were not calculated to incite to investigation; nor had history much to say on either topic. As to the sheep, now so much in evidence, the British wool-sack might afford a text suggestive of curious learning in connection with England's once greatest staple—how, for instance, as a protective measure it was by one Parliament solemnly ordained that the dead should be buried in woollens. But it will readily be admitted that the historic spirit does not kindle over tariff schedules. The lessons of experience to be drawn from revenue tables appeal rather to the school of Adam Smith than to the disciples of Gibbon.

Returning to the review of our national debates, we find that in 1892 the shadow of coming events was plainly perceptible. The tariff issue had now lost its old significance; for the infant industries had developed into trade and legislation-compelling trusts. These were suggestive of new and, as yet, inchoate problems; but to them the constituency was not prepared intelligently to address itself. Populism was rife, with its crude and restless theories; a crisis in the history of the precious metals was clearly impending, with the outcome in doubt; indiscriminate and unprecedented pension giving had reduced an overflowing exchequer to the verge of bankruptcy. The debate of 1892 accordingly dropped back to the politician's level, that of 1876, 1880 and 1884. In it there was nothing of any educational value; nothing that history will dwell upon. The "ins" pointed with pride; the "outs" sternly arraigned the "ins"; while the student, whether of economics or history, there found small place and a listless audience. The memory of the canvass which resulted in the second administration of Cleveland is quite obliterated by the issues, altogether unforeseen, which the ensuing years precipitated.

Of quite another character were the two canvasses of 1896 and 1900. Still fresh in memory, the echoes of these have indeed not yet ceased to reverberate; and I assert without hesitation that, not

since 1856 and 1860 has this people passed through two such wholesome and educational experiences. In 1896 and in 1900, as in the debates of forty years previous, there was a place, and a large place, for the student, whether investigator or philosopher. Great problems, problems of law, of economics and ethics, problems involving peace and war, and the course of development in the oldest as in the newest civilizations, had to be discussed, on the way to a solution. That the prolonged debate running through those eight years was at all equal to the occasion, I do not think can be claimed. Even his most ardent admirers will hardly suggest that Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900 rose to the level reached by Lincoln forty years before, nor do the utterances of either Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Depew or Mr. Hanna bear well a comparison with those of Seward, Trumbull and Sumner. And that this momentous, many-sided debate failed to rise to the proper height was due, I now unhesitatingly submit, to the predominance in it of the political "boss," and the absence from it of the scholar. In it, those belonging to this Association, and to other associations similar in character to this, did not play their proper part; they proved themselves unequal to the occasion. Indeed, in the whole wordy canvass of 1896 I now recall but two instances of the professor or philosopher distinctively taking the floor; but both of those were memorable. They imparted an elevation of tone to discussion, immediately and distinctly perceptible, in the press and on the platform. I refer to the single utterance of Carl Schurz, before a small audience at Chicago, on the 5th of September, 1896, and to the subsequent publications of President Andrew D. White, in which, from his library at Ithaca, he drew freely on the stores of historical experience in crushing refutation of demagogical campaign sophistry. Amid the petulant chattering of the political magpies it was refreshing to hear those clear-cut, incisive utterances,—calm, thoughtful, well-reasoned. I have been told that in its various forms of republication, no less than five millions, and some authorities say ten millions, of copies of that Chicago speech of Mr. Schurz were then put in circulation. It was indeed a masterly production, a production in which a high key-note was struck and sustained. But the suggestive and extremely encouraging fact in connection with it was the response it elicited. Delivering himself at the highest level to which he could attain, Mr. Schurz was only on a level with his audience. To the political optimist that fact spoke volumes; it revealed infinite possibilities.

Twelve presidential canvasses, and six great national debates have thus been passed in rapid review. It is as if, in the earlier

history of the country we had run the gamut from Washington to Van Buren. Taken as a whole, viewed in gross and perspective, the retrospect leaves much to be desired. That the debates held in Ireland and France during the same time have been on a distinctly lower level, I at once concede. Those held in Great Britain and Germany have not been on a higher. Yet ours have at best been only relatively educational; as a rule extremely partizan, they have been personal, often scurrilous, and intentionally deceptive. One fact is, however, salient. With the exception of the first, that of 1856-1860, not one of the debates reviewed has left an utterance which, were it to die from human memory, would by posterity be accounted a loss. This, I am aware, is a sweeping allegation; in itself almost an indictment. Yet with some confidence I challenge a denial. Those here are not as a rule in their first youth, and they have all of them been more or less students of history. Let each pass in rapid mental review the presidential canvasses in which he has in any degree participated, and endeavor to recall a single utterance which has stood the test of time as marking a distinct addition to mankind's intellectual belongings, the classics of the race. It has been at best a babel of the commonplace. I do not believe one utterance can be named, for which a life of ten years will be predicted. Such a record undeniably admits of improvement. Two questions then naturally suggest themselves: To what has this shortcoming been due? Wherein lies the remedy for it?

The shortcoming, I submit, is in greatest part due to the fact that the work of discussion has been left almost wholly to the journalist and the politician, the professional journalist and the professional politician; and, in the case of both there has in this country during the last forty years, been, so far as grasp of principle is concerned, a marked tendency to deterioration. Nor, I fancy, is the cause of this far to seek. It is found in the growth, increased complexity and irresistible power of organization as opposed to individuality, in the parlance of the day it is the all-potency of the machine over the man, equally noticeable whether by that word "machine" we refer to the political organization or to the newspaper.

The source of trouble being located in the tendency to excessive organization, it would seem natural that the counteracting agency should be looked for in an exactly opposite direction—that is, in the increased efficacy of individualism. Of this, I submit, it is not necessary to go far in search of indications. Take, for instance, the examples already referred to, of Mr. Schurz and President White, in the canvass of 1896, and suppose for a moment efforts such as theirs then were made more effective as resulting from the organ-

ized action of an association like this. Our platform at once becomes a rostrum, and a rostrum from which a speaker of reputation and character is insured a wide hearing. His audience too is there to listen, and repeat. From such a rostrum, the observer, the professor, the student, be it of economy, of history, or of philosophy, might readily be brought into immediate contact with the issues of the day. So bringing him is but a step. He would appear, also, in his proper character and place, the scholar having his say in politics; but always as a scholar, not as an office-holder or an aspirant for office. His appeal would be to intelligence and judgment, not to passion or self-interest, or even to patriotism. Congress has all along been but a clumsy recording machine of conclusions worked out in the laboratory and machine-shop; and yet the idea is still deeply seated in the minds of men otherwise intelligent that, to effect political results, it is necessary to hold office, or at least to be a politician and to be heard from the hustings. Is not the exact reverse more truly the case? The situation may not be, indeed it certainly is not, as it should be; it may be, I hold that it is, unfortunate that the scholar and investigator are finding themselves more and more excluded from public life by the professional with an aptitude for the machine, but the result is none the less patent. On all the issues of real moment,—issues affecting anything more than a division of the spoils or the concession of some privilege of exaction from the community, it is the student, the man of affairs and the scientist who to-day, in last resort, closes debate and shapes public policy. His is the last word. How to organize and develop his means of influence is the question.

“Here’s what should strike, could one handle it cunningly :
Help the axe, give it a helve !”

So far as the historian is concerned, this Association is, I submit, the helve to the axe.

Of this the presidential election which closed just a year ago affords an apt illustration, ready-at-hand. No better could be asked. What might then well have been? The American Historical Association, as I have already said, is composed of those who have felt a call for the investigation and treatment of historical problems. Its members, largely instructors in our advanced education, feel that keen interest in the issues of the day natural and proper in all good citizens, irrespective of calling. They want to contribute their share to discussion; and, in that way, to influence results, so far as in them lies. From every conceivable point of view it is most desirable that they should have facilities for so doing. I hold, therefore, that in the last presidential canvass, a special meeting of this

Association, called to discuss the issues then pending, might well have tended to the better general and popular comprehension of those issues, and to the elevation of that debate. Conducted on academic principles and looking to no formal expression of results in any enunciated platform of principles, such a gathering would have exercised an influence, as perceptible as beneficial, in lifting the discussion up into the domain of philosophy and research. It would have brought the lessons of the past to bear on the questions of the day. In any event, it would certainly not have descended to that contemptible *post ergo propter* formula, which, on the one side or the other, has in every presidential canvass been the main staple of argument.

What were the issues of the last presidential canvass? On what questions did its debate turn? Three in number, they were I think singularly inviting to those historically minded. To the reflecting man the matter first in importance was what is known as "imperialism," the problem forced upon our consideration by the outcome of the war with Spain. Next I should place the questions of public policy involved in the rapid agglomerations of capital, popularly denominated trusts. Finally the silver issue still lingered at the front, a legacy from the canvass of four years previous. The debate of 1900 is a thing of the past. Each of those issues can now be discussed, as it might well then have been discussed, in the pure historical spirit. Let us take them up in their inverse order.

Historically speaking, I hold there were two distinct sides to the silver question; and, moreover, on the face of the record, the advocates of bimetallism, as it was called, had in 1896 the weight of the argument wholly in their favor. In his very suggestive work entitled *Democracy and Liberty*, Mr. Lecky refers to the discovery of America as producing, among other far-reaching effects, one which he considers most momentous of all. To quote his words: "The produce of the American mines created, in the most extreme form ever known in Europe, the change which beyond all others affects most deeply and universally the material well-being of man: it revolutionized the value of the precious metals, and, in consequence, the price of all articles, the effects of all contracts, the burden of all debts." This was during the sixteenth century, the years following the great event of 1492. Again, the world went through a similar experience within our own memories, in consequence of the California and Australia gold-finds, between 1848 and 1852. These revolutions were due to natural causes, and came about gradually. They were also of a stimulating character. From the be-

ginning of modern commercial times, however, to the close of the last century, the exchanges of all civilized communities had been based on the precious metals ; and silver had been quite as much as gold a precious metal for monetary purposes. Shortly after 1870 the policy of demonetizing silver was entered upon ; and, in 1873, the United States gave in its adhesion to that policy. Thereafter, in the great system of international exchanges, silver ceased to be counted a part of that specie reserve on which drafts were made. Thenceforth, the drain, as among the financial centers, was to be on gold alone. In the whole history of man no precedent for such a step was to be found. So far as the United States was concerned the basis, on which its complex and delicate financial fabric rested, was weakened by one-half ; and the cheaper and more accessible metal, that to which the debtor would naturally have recourse in discharge of his obligations, was made unavailable. It could further be demonstrated that, without a complete readjustment of our currencies and values, the world's accumulated stock and annual production of gold could not, as a monetary basis, be made to suffice for its needs. A continually recurring contest for gold among the great financial centers was inevitable. "A change which," in the language of Lecky, "beyond all others affects most deeply and universally the material well-being of man" had been unwittingly challenged. The only question was : would the unexpected occur ? Then, if it did occur, what might be anticipated ? Such was the silver issue, as it presented itself in 1896. On the facts, the weight of argument was clearly with the advocates of silver.

Four years later, in 1900, the unexpected had occurred. As then resumed, the debate was replete with interest. The lessons of 1492 and 1848 had a direct bearing on the present, and, in the light by them shed, the outcome could be forecast almost with certainty ; but it was a world-question. Japan, China, Hindostan entered into the problem, in which also both Americas were factors. It was a theme to inspire Burke, stretching back, as it did, to the Middle Ages, and involving the whole circling globe. Rarely has any subject called for more intelligent and comprehensive investigation ; rarely has one been more confused and befogged by a denser misinformation. The discoverer and scientist, moving hand in hand, had, during the remission of the debate, been getting in their work, and under the touch of their silent influence, the world's gold production rose by leaps and bounds. Less than ten millions of ounces in 1896, in 1899 it had nearly touched fifteen millions ; and in money value, it alone then exceeded the combined value of the gold and silver production of the earlier period. What did this signify ?

History was only repeating itself. The experiences of the first half of the sixteenth century and the middle decennaries of the nineteenth century were to be emphasized during the opening years of the twentieth.

So much for the silver question and its possible treatment. In the discussion of 1900, the last word in the debate of 1896 remained to be uttered. A page in history, both memorable and instructive, was to be turned. Next trusts—those vast aggregations of capital in the hands of private combinations, constituting practical monopolies of whole branches of industry, and of commodities necessary to man. Was the world to be subject to taxation at the will of a moneyed syndicate? The debate of a year ago over this issue, if debate it may be called, is still very recent. In it the lessons of history were effectually ignored; and yet, if applied, they would have been sufficiently suggestive. The historian was as conspicuous for his absence as the demagogue was in evidence.

The cry was against monopoly and the monopolist, a cry which, as it has been ringing through all recorded times, suggests for the historical investigator a wide and fruitful field. Curiously enough the first lesson to be derived from labor in that field is a paradox. Practically, so far as extortion is concerned, there is almost nothing in common between the old time monopoly and the modern trust. Of examples of the first, the record is monotonously full. Mere agents of the government, sometimes the favorites of the Crown, the whole machinery of the state has time out of mind been put at the service of monopolists to enable them to exact tribute from all. To the student of English history the names and misdeeds of Sir Richard Empson and Sir Giles Mompesson at once suggest themselves; while others more familiar with the drama recall Sir Giles Overreach, or that powerful scene in *Ruy Blas* in which the Spanish courtiers wrangle together, coming almost to blows, over a division among themselves of the right to extort. The old system still survives. For example, in France to-day the manufacture and sale of salt is a government monopoly. A prime necessity of life, no person not specially authorized may engage in the production of salt, or import it. If a peasant woman, living on the sea-coast of Brittany or Normandy, endeavors to procure salt for her family by the slow process of evaporating a pailful of sea water in the sun, she is engaged in an illicit trade, and becomes amenable to law. Her salt will certainly, if found, be confiscated. So of improved pocket matches. In France, their manufacture is a government revenue monopoly. They are notoriously bad. Those made and sold in Great Britain are on the contrary noted for excellence. If,

however, a box of English matches is found in the pocket of a traveller passing from England to France, it is taken from him and the contents are destroyed at once; indeed he is fortunate if he escapes the payment of a fine. This is monopoly; the whole strength of a government being put forth to exact an artificial profit on the sale of a commodity in general use. There is an historical literature pertaining to the subject, a lamentation, and an ancient tale of wrong.

The curious feature in the present discussion, that which in the mind of the student of things as opposed to words imparts a special interest to it, is that, while the trust or vast aggregation of capital and machinery of production in the hands of individuals intended to control competition is in fact the modern form of monopoly, it is in its methods and results the direct opposite of the old time monopoly; for, whereas, the purpose and practice of that was to extort from all purchasers an artificial price for an inferior article through the suppression of competitors, the first law of its existence for the modern trust is, through economies and magnitude of production, to supply to all buyers a better article at a price so low that other producers are driven from the market. The ground of popular complaint against them is not that they exact an inordinate profit on what they sell, but that they sell so low that the small manufacturer or merchant is deprived of his trade. This distinction with a difference explains at once the wholly futile character of the politician's outcry against trusts. It is easy, for instance, to denounce from the platform the magnates of the Sugar Trust to a sympathizing audience; and yet not one human being in that audience, his sympathies to the contrary notwithstanding, will the next morning pay a fraction of a cent more per pound for his sugar, that by so doing he may help to keep alive some struggling manufacturer who advertises that his product does not bear the trust stamp.

As to the outcome of conflicts of this character history tells but one story. They can have but one result, a readjustment of industries. A single familiar illustration will suffice. Any one who chooses to turn back to it, can read the story of the long conflict between the loom and the spindle. Formerly, and not so very far back, the distaff and spinning-wheel were to be seen in every house; homespun was the common wear. To-day the average man or woman has never seen a distaff, or heard the hum of a spinning-wheel. Ceasing long since to be a commodity, homespun would be sought for in vain. Yet the struggle between the loom of the manufacturing trust and the old dame's spinning-wheel was, literally, for the latter, a fight to the death; for, in that case, the livelihood of

the operator was at stake. Her time was worth absolutely nothing, except at the wheel; she must needs work for any wage; on it depended her bread. A vast domestic, industrial readjustment was involved; one implying untold human suffering. The result was, however, never for an instant in doubt. The trust of that day was left in undisputed control of the field; and it always must, and always will be, just so long as it supplies purchasers with a better article, at a lower price than they had to pay before. The process does not vary; the only difference is that each succeeding readjustment is on a larger scale and more far-reaching in its effects.

Such, stripped of its verbiage and appeals to sympathy, is the trust proposition. But the popular apprehension always has been, as it now is, that this supply of the better article at a lower price will continue only until the producer, the monopolist has secured a complete mastery of the situation. Capital, it is argued, is selfish and greedy, corporations are proverbially soulless and insatiable; and, as soon as competition is eliminated, nature will assert itself. Prices will then be raised so as to assure inordinate gains; and when, in consequence of such profits, fresh competitors enter the field, they will either be crushed out of existence by a temporary reduction in price, or absorbed in the trust.

All this has a plausible sound; and of it as a theory of practical outcome the politician can be relied on to make the most. But on this head what has the historical investigator to say? His will be the last word in that debate also; his verdict will be final. The lessons bearing on this contention to be drawn from the record cover a wide field of both time and space; they also silence discussion. They tend indisputably to show that the dangers depicted are imaginary. The subject must, of course, be approached in an unprejudiced spirit and studied in a large, comprehensive way. Permanent tendencies are to be dealt with; and exceptional cases must be instanced, classified and allowed for. Attempts, more or less successful, at extortion in a confidence of mastery, can unquestionably be pointed out; but, in the history of economical development, it is no less unquestionable that, on the large scale and in the long run, every new concentration has been followed by a permanent reduction of price in the commodity affected thereby. The world's needs are continually supplied at a lower cost to the world. Again, the larger the concentration, the cheaper the product; until now a new truth of the market place has become established and obtained general acceptance, a truth of the most far-reaching consequence, the truth that the largest returns are found in quick sales at small profits. To manage successfully one of those great and complex indus-

trial combinations calls for exceptional administrative capacity in individuals, for men of quick perception and masterful tempers. These men must be able correctly to read the lessons of experience, and, accepting the facts of the situation, they must find out how most exactly to adapt themselves to those facts. No theorist, be he politician or philosopher, appreciates so clearly as does the successful trust executive the fundamental laws of being of the interests they have in charge. They have good cause to know that under conditions now prevailing, competition is the sure corollary of the attempted abuse of control; and, moreover, that the largest ultimate returns on capital, as well as the only real security from competition, are found not in the disposal of a small product at large profits, but in a large output at prices which encourage consumption. Throwing exceptional cases and temporary conditions out of consideration, as not affecting final results, the historical investigator will probably on this subject find himself much at variance with the political canvasser. That the last will get worsted in the argument hardly needs be said.

Does history furnish any instance of a financial, an industrial or a commercial enterprise,—a bank, a factory, or an importing company,—ever having been powerful enough long to regulate the price of any commodity regardless of competition, except when acting in harmony with and supported by governmental power? Is not the monopolist practically impotent, unless he has the constable at his call? To answer this question absolutely would be to deduce a law of the first importance from the general experience of mankind. So doing would call for a far more careful examination than is now in my power to make, were it even within the scope of my ability; but if my supposition prove correct, the corollary to be drawn therefrom is to us as a body politic and at just this juncture, one of the first and most far-reaching import. In such case, the modern American trust, also, so far as it enjoys any power as a monopoly, or admits of abuse as such, must depend for that power and the opportunity of abuse solely on governmental support and coöperation. Its citadel is then the custom house. The moment the United States revenue officer withdrew his support, the American monopolist would cease to monopolize, except in so far as he could defy competition by always supplying a better article at a price lower than any other producer in the whole world. And here, having deduced and formulated this law, the purely historical investigator would find himself trenching on the province of the economist. The so-called protective system would now be in question. Thus again, as so often before, the tariff would

become the paramount issue. But the tariff would no longer stand in the popular mind as the beneficent protector of domestic enterprise; it would, on the contrary, be closely associated with the idea of monopoly, it would be assailed as the Bastille of the monopolist. From the historical and economical points of view, however, the debate would not, because of that, undergo any diminution of interest. Whatever the politician might in discussion assert, or the opportunist incorporate into legislation, we may rest assured that this issue will ultimately settle itself in accordance with those irresistible underlying influences which result in what we know as natural evolution. History is but the record of the adjustment of mankind in the past to the outcome of those influences, moral, geological, industrial and climatic; and, in this respect, when all is said and done, it is tolerably safe to predict that the future will present no features of novelty. If, then, we can measure correctly the nature of the influences at work, experience furnishes the data from which the character, as well as the extent, of the impending readjustment may be surmised. For such a diagnosis the historian and economist are requisite.

It remains to pass on to the third and last of the matters in debate during 1900, that known as imperialism. This was the really great issue before the American people then; and it is the really great issue before them now. That issue, moreover, I with confidence submit, can be intelligently considered only from the historical standpoint. Indeed, unless approached through the avenues of human experience, it is not even at once apparent how the question, as it now confronts us, arose and injected itself into our political action; and accordingly, it is in some quarters even currently assumed that it is there only fortuitously, a feature in the great chapter of accidents, a passing incident, which may well disappear as mysteriously and as suddenly as it came. Studied historically, I do not think this view of the situation will bear examination. On the contrary, I fancy even the most superficial investigator, if actuated in his inquiry by the true historical spirit, would soon reach the conclusion that the issue so recently forced upon us had been long in preparation, was logical and inevitable, and for our good or our evil must be decided, rightly or wrongly, on a large view of great and complex conditions. In other words, there may be reason to conclude that an inscrutable law of nature, at last involving us, has long been and now is evolving results. It is one more phase of natural evolution, working itself out, as in the case of Rome twenty-five centuries ago, through the survival and supremacy of the fittest.

I need hardly say, I feel myself now venturing on some dangerous generalizations; and yet I do not see how the American investigator, who endeavors to draw his conclusions from history, can recoil from the venture. His deductions will probably be erroneous—indeed, they are sure to be so to some extent; and, in making them, he is more than likely to betray a very considerable capacity in the line of superficiality. None the less, even if it be of small value, he is bound to offer what he has. If the seed he throws bears no fruit, it can do small harm.

Mr. Leslie Stephen, in one of his essays, truly enough says: "The Catholic and the Protestant, the Conservative and the Radical, the Individualist and the Socialist, have equal facility in proving their own doctrines with arguments, which habitually begin, 'All history shows.' Printers should be instructed always to strike out that phrase as an erratum, and to substitute 'I choose to take for granted.'" And elsewhere the same writer lays it down as a general proposition that: "Arguments beginning 'all history shows' are always sophistical."¹ What is by some known as the doctrine of manifest destiny is, I take it, identical with what others, more piously minded, refer to as the will, or call, of God. The Mohammedan and the modern Christian gospel-monger say "God clearly calls us" to this or that work; and with a conscience perfectly clear, they then proceed to rob, slay and oppress. In like manner, the political buccaneer and land-pirate proclaims that the possession of his neighbor's territory is rightfully his by manifest destiny. The philosophical politician next drugs the conscience of his fellowmen by declaring solemnly that "all history shows" that might is right; and with time, the court of last appeal, it must be admitted possession is nine points in the law's ten. It cannot be denied, also, that quite as many crimes have been perpetrated in the name of God and of manifest destiny as in that of liberty. That, at least, "all history shows." But, all the same, just as liberty is notwithstanding a good and desirable thing, so God does live and will, and there is something in manifest destiny. As applied to the development of the races inhabiting the earth it is, I take it, merely an unscientific form of speech; the word now in vogue is evolution, the phrase "survival of the fittest." When all is said and done, that unreasoning instinct of a people which carries it forward in spite of and over theories to its manifest destiny, amid the despairing outcries and long-drawn protestations of theorists and ethical philosophers, is a very considerable factor in making history; and, consequently one to be reckoned with.

¹ *Social Rights and Duties*, Vol. I., p. 129; *An Agnostic's Apology*, p. 260.

In plain words then, and Mr. Stephen to the contrary notwithstanding, "all history shows" that every great, aggressive and masterful race tends at times irresistibly towards the practical assertion of its supremacy, usually at the cost of those not so well adapted to existing conditions. In his great work Mommsen formulates the law with a brutal directness distinctly Germanic:

"By virtue of the law, that a people which has grown into a state absorbs its neighbours who are in political nonage, and a civilized people absorbs its neighbours who are in intellectual nonage—by virtue of this law, which is as universally valid and as much a law of nature as the law of gravity—the Italian nation (the only one in antiquity which was able to combine a superior political development and a superior civilization, though it presented the latter only in an imperfect and external manner) was entitled to reduce to subjection the Greek states of the East which were ripe for destruction, and to dispossess the peoples of lower grades of culture in the West—Libyans, Iberians, Celts, Germans—by means of its settlers; just as England with equal right has in Asia reduced to subjection a civilization of rival standing, but politically impotent, and in America and Australia has marked and ennobled and still continues to mark and enoble, extensive barbarian countries with the impress of its nationality."¹

Professor Von Holst again states a corollary from the law thus laid down in terms scarcely less explicit, in connection with a well-known and much discussed act of foreign spoliation in our own comparatively recent history: "It is as easy to bid a ball that has flown from the mouth of the gun to stop in its flight, and return on its path, as to terminate a successful war of conquest by a voluntary surrender of all conquests, because it has been found out that the spoil will be a source of dissension at home."² And then Von Holst quotes a very significant as well as philosophical utterance of William H. Seward's, which a portion of our earnest protestants of to-day would do well to ponder: "I abhor war, as I detest slavery. I would not give one human life for all the continents that remain to be annexed; but I cannot exclude the conviction that the popular passion for territorial aggrandizement is irresistible. Prudence, justice, cowardice, may check it for a season, but it will gain strength by its subjugation. . . . It behooves us then to qualify ourselves for our mission. We must dare our destiny."³ One more, and I have done with quotations. The last I just now commended to the thoughtful consideration of those classified in the political nomenclature of the day as Anti-Imperialists. A most conscientious and high-minded class, possessed with the full courage of their convictions, the efforts of the Anti-Imperialists

¹ *History of Rome*, Book V., chap. 7.

² *History of the United States*, Vol. III., p. 304.

³ *Works*, Vol. III., p. 409.

will not fail, we and they may rest assured, to make themselves felt. They enter into the grand result. Nevertheless, for them also there is food for thought, perhaps for consolation, in this other general law, laid down in 1862 by Richard Cobden, than whose, in my judgment, the utterances of no English speaking man in the nineteenth century were more replete with shrewd sense expressed in plain, terse English :

"From the moment the first shot is fired, or the first blow is struck, in a dispute, then farewell to all reason and argument; you might as well attempt to reason with mad dogs as with men when they have begun to spill each other's blood in mortal combat. I was so convinced of the fact during the Crimean war, which, you know, I opposed, I was so convinced of the utter uselessness of raising one's voice in opposition to war when it has once begun, that I made up my mind that as long as I was in political life, should a war again break out between England and a great Power, I would never open my mouth upon the subject from the time the first gun was fired until the peace was made, because, when a war is once commenced, it will only be by the exhaustion of one party that a termination will be arrived at. If you look back at our history, what did eloquence, in the persons of Chatham or Burke, do to prevent a war with our first American colonies? What did eloquence, in the persons of Fox and his friends, do to prevent the French revolution, or bring it to a close? And there was a man who at the commencement of the Crimean war, in terms of eloquence, in power, and pathos, and argument equal—in terms, I believe, fit to compare with anything that fell from the lips of Chatham and Burke—I mean your distinguished townsman, my friend Mr. Bright—and what was his success? Why, they burnt him in effigy for his pains."

Turning from the authorities, and the lessons by them deduced from the record called History, let us now consider the problem precipitated on the American people by the Spanish war of 1898. That question,—the burning political issue of the hour,—I propose here and now to discuss. I propose to discuss it, however, from the purely historical standpoint, and not at all in its moral or economical aspects. So far then as this question is concerned, the last presidential vote, that of 1900, settled nothing, except that the policy which had assumed a certain degree of form in the treaty of Paris should not be reversed. All else was left for debate, and ulterior settlement. Certain lessons, calculated greatly to influence the character of that settlement, can, I submit, now be most advantageously drawn from history. At formulating those lessons I propose here to try my hand.

The first and most important lesson is one which, in theory at least, is undisputed; though to live up to it practically calls for a courage of conviction not yet in evidence. That a dependency is not merely a possession, but a trust, a trust for the future, for itself and for humanity, is accepted by us in this debate as a postulate :

accordingly, our dependencies are in no wise to be exploited for the general benefit of the alien owner, or that of individual components of that owner, but they are to be dealt with in a large and altruistic spirit with an unselfish view to their own utmost development, materially, morally and politically. And, through a process of negatives, "all history shows" that only when this course is hereafter wisely and consecutively pursued, should that blessed consummation ever be attained, will the dominating power itself derive the largest and truest benefit from its possessions.

As yet no American of any character, much less of authority, has come forward to controvert this proposition. That it will be controverted, and attempts made by interested parties to sophisticate it away through the cunningly arranged display of exceptional circumstances, can with safety be predicted. In this respect, to use a cant phrase, "we know how it is ourselves." We all remember, for instance, the unspeakable code of factitious morals and deceptive philosophy manufactured to order in these United States as a "Gospel of Niggerdom" less than half a century ago. Coming down to more recent times, we can none of us yet have forgotten the wretched sophistry ignorantly resurrected from the French Revolution and assignat days in glorification of "Fiat Money," and a business world emancipated at last from any heretofore accepted measures of value. The leopard, rest assured, has not changed its spots since either 1860 or 1876. The "New Gospel" phase of the debate now on is, however, yet to develop itself. But, assuming the correctness of the proposition I have just formulated, a corollary follows from it. A formidable proposition, I state it without limitations, meaning to challenge contradiction, I submit that there is not an instance in all recorded history, from the earliest precedent to that now making, where a so-called inferior race or community has been elevated in its character, or made self-sustaining and self-governing, or even put on the way to that result, through a condition of dependency or tutelage. I say "inferior race"; but, I fancy, I might state the proposition even more broadly. I might, without much danger, assert that the condition of dependency, even for communities of the same race and blood, always exercises an emasculating and deteriorating influence. I would undertake, if called upon, to show also that this rule is invariable,—that, from the inherent and fundamental conditions of human nature it has known and can know no exceptions. This truth, also, I would demonstrate from well-nigh innumerable examples, that of our own colonial period among the number. In our case, it required a century to do away in our minds and hearts with our dependential traditions. The Civil War,

and not what we call the Revolution, was our real war of Independence. And yet in our time of dependency you will remember we were not emasculated into a resigned and even cheerful self-incapacity as the natural result of a kindly, paternal and protective policy; but, as Burke with profound insight expressed it, with us the spirit of independence and self-support was fostered "through a wise and salutary neglect." But, for present purposes, all this is unnecessary, and could lead but to a poor display of commonplace learning. The problem to-day engaging the attention of the American people is more limited. It relates solely to what are called "inferior races"; those of the same race, or of cognate races, we as yet do not propose to hold in a condition of permanent dependency; those we absorb, or assimilate. Only those of "inferior race," the less developed or decadent, do we propose to hold in subjection, dealing with them, in theory at least, as a guardian deals with a family of wards.

My proposition then broadens. If history teaches anything in this regard it is that race elevation, the capacity in a word for political self-support, cannot be imparted through tutelage. Moreover, the milder, the more paternal, kindly and protective the guardianship, the more emasculating it will prove. A "wise and salutary neglect" is the more beneficent policy; for, with races as with individuals, a state of dependency breeds the spirit of dependency. Take Great Britain for instance. That people, working at it now consecutively through three whole centuries, after well-nigh innumerable experiences and as many costly blunders, Great Britain has, I say, developed a genius for dealing with dependencies, for the government of "inferior races"; a genius far in advance of anything the world has seen before. Yet my contention is that, to-day, after three rounded centuries of British rule, the Hindus, the natives of India, in spite of all material, industrial and educational improvements—roads, schools, justice and peace—are in 1900 less capable of independent and ordered self-government, than they were in the year 1600, the year when the East India Company was incorporated under a patent of Elizabeth. The native Indian dynasties, those natural to the Hindus, have disappeared; accustomed to foreign rule the people have no rulers of their own, nor could they rule themselves. The rule of aliens has with Hindostan thus become a domestic necessity. Remove it—and the highest and most recent authorities declare it surely will some day be removed—chaos would inevitably ensue. What is true of India is true of Egypt. That, under British rule, Egypt is to-day in better material and political case than ever before in its history, modern, biblical, hiero-

glyphic or legendary, scarcely admits of dispute. Schools, roads, irrigation, law and order, and protection from attack, she has them all ;

“ But what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail ? ”

The capacity for self-government is not acquired in that school.

But of this England itself furnishes an example in its own history, an example well-nigh forgotten. In fundamentals human nature is much the same now as twenty centuries back. During the first century of the present era, the Romans, acting in obedience to the law laid down by Mommsen—the law quoted by me in full, and the law of which Thomas Carlyle is the latest and most eloquent exponent, the law known as the Divine Right of the most Masterful—acting in obedience to that law, the Romans in the year of Grace 43 crossed the British channel, overthrew the Celts and Gauls gathered in defence of what they mistakenly deemed their own, and, after reducing them to subjection, permanently occupied the land. They remained there four centuries, a hundred years longer than the English have been in Calcutta. During that period they introduced civilization, established Christianity, constructed roads, dwellings and fortifications. Materially, the condition of the country vastly improved. The Romans protected the inhabitants against their enemies ; also against themselves. During hundreds of years they benevolently assimilated them. Doubtless on the banks of the Tiber the inhabitants of what is now England were deemed incapable of self-government. Probably they were ; unquestionably they became so. When the legions were at last withdrawn, the results of a kindly paternalism, secure protection and intelligent tutelage became apparent. The race was wholly emasculate. It cursed its independence ; it deplored its lost dependency. As the English historian now records the result—“ They forgot how to fight for their country when they forgot how to govern it.”¹

Man is always in a hurry ; God never !—is a familiar saying. Certainly, nature works with a discouraging indifference to generations. Each passing race of reformers and regenerators does indisputably love to witness some results of its efforts ; but, in the case of England, in consequence of the emasculation incident to tutelage, and dependency on a powerful, a benevolent and beneficent foreign rule, after that rule ended—as soon or late such rule always must end—throughout the lives of eighteen successive generations emasculated England was over-run. At last, with some half dozen intermediate rulers, the Normans succeeded the Romans. They were conquering masters ; but they domesticated themselves in the

¹ Green, *Short History of the English People*, Vol. I., p. 9.

British Islands, and in time assimilated the inhabitants thereof, Saxons, Picts and Celts, benevolently or otherwise. But, as nearly as the historian can fix it, it required eight hundred years of direst tribulation to educate the people of England out of that spirit of self-distrust and dependency into which they had been reduced by four centuries of paternalism, at once Roman and temporarily beneficent. Twelve centuries is certainly a discouraging term to which to look forward. But steam and electricity have since then been developed to a manifest quickening of results. Even the pace of nature was in the nineteenth century vastly accelerated.

Briefly stated then, the historical deduction would seem to be somewhat as follows: where a race has in itself, whether implanted there by nature or as the result of education, the elevating instinct and energy, the capacity of mastership, a state of dependency will tend to educate that capacity out of existence; and the more beneficent, paternal and protecting the guardian power is, the more pernicious its influence becomes. In such cases, the course most beneficial in the end to the dependency, now as a century ago, would be that characterized by "a wise and salutary neglect." Where, however, a race is for any cause not possessed of the innate saving capacity, being stationary or decadent, a state of dependency, while it may improve material conditions, tends yet further to deteriorate the spirit and to diminish the capacity of self-government; if severe, it brutalizes; if kindly, it enervates. History records no instance in which it develops and strengthens.

Following yet further the teachings of experience, we are thus brought to a parting of the ways, a parting distinct, unmistakable. Heretofore the policy of the United States, as a nationality, has, so far as the so-called inferior races are concerned, been confined in its operation to the North American continent; but, as a whole and in its large aspects, it has been well defined and consistent. We have proceeded on the theory that all government should in the end rest on the consent of the governed; that any given people is competent to govern itself in some fashion, and that, in the long run, any fashion of self-imposed government works better results than will probably be worked by a government imposed from without. In other words, the American theory has been that, in the process of nature and looking to ultimate, perhaps remote, conditions, any given people, not admitting of assimilation, will best work out its destiny when left free to work it out in its own way. Moreover, so far as outside influence is concerned, it can, in the grand result, be more effectively exercised through example than by means of active intervention. Where we have not therefore forcibly absorbed into

our system foreign and inferior races or elements, and more or less completely assimilated them, we have, up to very recently, adopted and applied what may perhaps in homely speech best be described as a "Hands-off and Walk-alone" doctrine, relying in our policy towards others on the theory practiced at our private firesides, the theory that self-government results from example, and is self-taught. I have already quoted Richard Cobden in this connection; I will quote him again. Referring, in 1864, to the British foreign policy, then by him as by us denounced, though by us now imitated, Cobden said: "I maintain that a man is best doing his duty at home in striving to extend the sphere of liberty, commercial, literary, political, religious, and in all directions; for if he is working for liberty at home, he is working for the advancement of the principles of liberty all over the world."

Mexico and Hayti afford striking illustrations of a long and rigid adherence to this policy on our part, and of the results of that adherence. Conquering and dismembering Mexico in 1847, we, in 1848, left it to its own devices. So completely had the work of subjugation been done, that our representatives had actually to call into being a Mexican government with which to arrange terms of peace. With that simulacrum of a national authority we made a solemn treaty; and, after so doing, left Mexico to work out its destiny, if it could, as it could. In spite of numerous domestic convulsions and much internal anarchy, from that day to this we have neither ourselves intervened in the internal affairs of our southern continental neighbor, nor long permitted such interference by others. To Mexico, we have said "Walk-alone"; to France, "Hands-off." The result we all know. It has gone far to justify our theory of the true path of human advancement. Forty years is, in matters of race development, a short time. A period much too short to admit of drawing positive, or final, inferences. Dr. Holmes was once asked by an anxious mother when the education of a child should begin; his prompt, if perhaps unexpected, reply was: "Not less than 250 years before it is born." To-day, and under existing conditions, Mexico, though republican in name and form only, is self-governing in reality. It is manifestly working its problem out in its own way. The statement carries with it implications hardly consistent with the might-is-right latter-day dispensation voiced by Mommsen and Carlyle.

Hayti presents another case in point, with results far more trying to our theory. We have towards Hayti pursued exactly the policy pursued by us with Mexico. Not interfering ourselves in the internal affairs of the island, we have not permitted interference by

others. For the condition of affairs prevailing in Hayti, occupied by an inferior race, apparently lapsing steadily toward barbarism, the United States is morally responsible. Acting on the law laid down in the extract I have given from the pages of Mommsen, we might at any time during the last quarter of a century have intervened in the name of humanity, and to the great temporary advantage of the inhabitants of the one region "where Black rules White." The United States, in pursuance of its theories, has abstained from so doing. It has abstained in the belief that, in the long run and grand result, the inhabitants of Hayti will best work out their problem, if left to work it out themselves. In any event, however, exceptional cases are the rocks on which sound principles come to wreck; and, so far as the race of man on earth is concerned, it is better that Hayti should suffer self-caused misfortune for centuries, as did England before, than that a precedent should be created for the frequent violation of a great principle of natural development. Yet the case of Hayti is crucial. Persistently to apply our policy there evinces, it must be admitted, a robust faith in the wisdom of its universal application. The logical inference, so far as the Philippine Islands is concerned, is obvious.

Historically speaking, those now referred to are the only two theories of a national policy to be pursued in dealing with the practical dependencies, which challenge consideration, the American and the British. The others, whether ancient and abandoned, or modern and in use,—Phoenician, Roman, Spanish, French, Dutch, German or Russian,—may be dismissed from the discussion. They none of them ever did, nor do any of them now, look to an altruistic result. In all, the dependency is confessedly exploited on business principles, with an eye to the trade development of the alien proprietor. Setting these aside, there remain only the American, or "Walk-alone and Hands-off" theory; and the British, or "Ward in Chancery" theory. The first is exemplified in Mexico and Hayti; the last in Hindostan and Egypt. The question now in debate for the United States may, therefore, be concisely stated thus: taking the Philippine Islands as a subject for treatment, and the ultimate elevation of the inhabitants of those islands to self-government as the end in view, which is the policy best calculated to lead to the result desired,—the traditional and distinctively American system, as exemplified in the cases of Mexico and Hayti, or the modern and improved British system, to be studied in Hindostan and Egypt?

Subject to limitations of time and space I have now passed in review the great political debates which have occupied the attention

of the American public during the last half century. I have endeavored to call attention to the plane on which those debates have been conducted, and to the noticeable absence from them of a scholarly spirit. The judicial temper and the patience necessary to any thorough investigation have in them, I submit, been conspicuously lacking. Then, starting from the point of view peculiar to this Association, I have examined the issues presented to the country in the last presidential canvass, and, for purposes of illustration, I have discussed them, always in a purely historical temper.

While the result of my experiment is for others to pass upon, my own judgment is clear and decided. I hold that the time has now come when organizations such as this of ours, instead of, as heretofore, scrupulously standing aloof from the political debate, are under obligation to participate in it. As citizens, we most assuredly should, in so far as we may properly so do, contribute to results, whether immediate, or more or less remote. As scholars and students, the conclusions we have to present should be deserving of thoughtful consideration. The historical point of view moreover, is, politically, an important point of view; for only when approached historically, by one looking before as well as after, can any issue be understood in its manifold relations with a complex civilization. Indeed, the moral point of view can in its importance alone compare with the historical. The economical, vital as it unquestionably often is, comes much lower in the scale; for, while an approach through both these avenues is not infrequently necessary to the intelligent comprehension of questions of a certain class, such, for instance, as the tariff or currency, it is very noticeable that, though many issues present themselves, slavery or imperialism for example, into which economical considerations do not enter as controlling factors, there is scarcely any matter of political debate which does not to some extent at least have to be discussed historically. Still, though our retrospect has proved this to be the case, the scarcely less significant fact also appears that not more than one presidential canvass in two involves any real issue at all, moral or economical. Of the last twelve elections, covering the half century, six were mere struggles for political control; and so far as can now be seen, the course of subsequent events would have been in no material respect other than it was whichever party prevailed. Judging by experience, therefore, in only one future canvass out of two will any occasion arise for a careful historical presentation of facts. The investigator will not be called upon; and, if he rises to take part in the discussion, he will do no harm for the excellent reason that no one will listen to him. In the other of each two

canvasses it is not so. There is then apt to be a real debate over a paramount issue; and, in all such, the strong search-light of experience should be thrown, clearly and fully, over the road we are called upon to traverse. In every such case, the presentation, provided always it be made in the true historical spirit, should by no means be of one side only. On the contrary, every phase of the record should have its advocate; every plausible lesson should be drawn. The facts are many, complicated and open to a varied construction; and it is only through the clash of opposing views that they can be reduced to comparative system, and compelled to yield their lessons for guidance.

As I have also, more than once already, observed, this Association is largely made up of those occupying the chairs of instruction in our seminaries of the higher education. From their lecture rooms the discussion of current political issues is of necessity excluded. There it is manifestly out of place. Others here are scholars for whom no place exists on the political platform. Still others are historical investigators and writers, interested only incidentally in political discussion. Finally some are merely public-spirited citizens, on whom the oratory of the stump palls. They crave discussion of another order. They are the men whose faces are seen only at those gatherings which some one eminent for thought or in character is invited to address. To all such, the suggestion I now make cannot but be grateful. It is that, in future, this Association, as such, shall so arrange its meetings that one at least shall be held in the month of July preceding each presidential election. The issues of that election will then have been presented, and the opposing candidates named. It should be understood that the meeting is held for the purpose of discussing those issues from the historical point of view, and in their historical connection. Absolute freedom of debate should be insisted on, and the participation of those best qualified to deal with the particular class of problems under discussion, should be solicited. Such authorities, speaking from so lofty a rostrum to a select audience of appreciative men and women could, I confidently submit, hardly fail to elevate the standard of discussion, bringing the calm lessons of history to bear on the angry wrangles and distorted presentations of those whose chief, if not only, aim is a mere party supremacy.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

THE CREDIBILITY OF EARLY ROMAN HISTORY¹

A REPROACH frequently cast at those who are engaged in the study of classical antiquity, is that their subject-matter has been worked over so long and so often that no further results can be obtained that have any value for men of the present. When new fields of research are so widely spread around us, it is worse than foolish to spend the time and effort on the old. Be this as it may, there is still one phase of the study of classical antiquity which has so far escaped the general condemnation. History, even of the olden time, has not yet become the object of the scorn of exponents of the latest educational ideas, and is in fact very much in vogue. The historical method must be applied, and rightly, to all branches of scientific study, and in spite of the unwillingness on the part of many to recognize the fact, it has been true for some years that teachers of the classics have insisted that the full culture-value of their subject could be obtained only when proper attention was paid to the social, political and economic conditions under which the literature was developed.

If we look carefully to the history of the world, what can be more important than a correct appreciation of the early centuries in the history of Greece and Rome, periods during one of which were developed the literature and art which have ever since been the unattainable standard of the world, and during the other of which that power arose which has been the paramount influence in law and government in all succeeding ages. Certainly we can not be accused of dealing with dead issues in laboring over the problems presented to us in either of these fields, and it is to the nature of the early history of the city of Rome that I now ask your attention.

It is a mere commonplace to remark that the earliest stages in the history of most peoples present very great difficulties in the way of arriving at anything like the exact facts, and this is usually due to the insufficiency of evidence that has come down to us, and to the inevitable errors resulting from the nature of tradition. In the case of the early history of the greatest city in the world, the difficulty is immeasurably increased by the well-known fact, that

¹ An address delivered by the President of the American Philological Association at its annual meeting, held in Cambridge, Mass., July, 1901.

in addition to all the errors inherent in the methods of transmission, we have to do with a considerable amount of material which is known to be the product of the deliberate invention of later times. So while the problem becomes exceedingly perplexing, the eagerness of scholars to solve it, becomes correspondingly keen. Nor can it be said that time and labor expended on its solution are wasted, so long as any hope remains of arriving at something like the real facts.

There are certain peculiar features in the case of Roman history, the most noticeable of which is the character of Roman literature, on which we must depend so much for our information. Here is no developing native product, but a literature due to foreign impulse, and worked out in conscious imitation of Greek models, both as regards form and substance. The earliest annalists of Rome intentionally followed their patterns, and the elimination of the Greek from the native is one of the most difficult parts of the problem. Most noticeable again in its effect upon the tradition of Roman history, was the servile attitude maintained towards Rome by the rest of the world after the Punic wars, which resulted in a deliberate falsification of everything in favor of the dominant power. With a very few apparent exceptions like Metrodorus of Skepsis, almost all historiographers of that period took part in the general chorus of adulation, entirely regardless of the truth. A third peculiarity of the situation is the presence of what was really an official or "canonical" tradition. The methods employed by the Greek and Roman manufacturers of early history, had resulted in the promulgation of numerous narratives of the same events, so contradictory as to disturb even the Romans themselves, and to bring about the formation of a sort of official version which became in a sense "canonical," and was generally accepted by the principal writers of the post-Ciceronian age. This is the account that Livy, for instance, usually presents, although all our historians do not hesitate to give very frequently other versions along with the "canonical." These conditions were recognized by the Roman historians themselves, but with hardly an exception, they failed entirely to develop what we call the critical method. Beyond a certain point this could not have been expected, but it is a source of surprise and disappointment that we have to wait until the close of the first century to find a Roman Thucydides.

The legacy of Rome, then, to the world, so far as her own early history is concerned, is a mass of fable, fact and fancy, inextricably interwoven, and commended to us by all the charm of Livian rhetoric, and this inheritance has been accepted and enjoyed with-

out question or cavil, by the vast majority even of scholars until very recent times. But it was inevitable that a day of reckoning should come, and as we all know, it was in the study of Niebuhr that the demolition and reconstruction of Roman history began. Niebuhr, Schwegler, Mommsen! Three mighty names to conjure with, and how great a contribution to the science of historical criticism they represent! But as in all other departments of human knowledge, where room for the erection of what is to last forever must be cleared by the destruction of what is insecure, the pendulum of belief swings widely but irregularly, sometimes rapidly, sometimes slowly, and it is long before the stable equilibrium of admitted fact is reached.

So in the matter under discussion, we have passed through the stage where all that has come down to us about the regal period was ruthlessly cast aside as absolutely false, the succeeding stage when men were inclined to see much that was true beneath the overlying strata of legend, then a stage when, in some quarters at least, an almost medieval attitude of belief was assumed, and now finally a period when even the first condition of skepticism seems to be well-nigh surpassed. There is, if we may so speak, a very renaissance of unbelief with regard to the first three centuries of Rome's existence. This oscillation may be paralleled perhaps by the change in the position of scholars with respect to the Old Testament, and in the field of Roman life, by the varying estimates of Cicero, his character and influence. From Drumann and Mommsen to Aly and Zielinski is a far cry, and between them in time and opinion we find everything from entire repudiation of a political renegade to unquestioning faith in the saviour of the commonwealth. But as the latest voice of Ciceronian criticism has tended to rehabilitate the great orator, the latest voice of historical criticism, uttered too by a descendant of the Romans themselves, is the most powerful yet heard in the attack upon all that tradition has handed down concerning the early history of Rome.

I refer of course to Ettore Pais and his great work *La Storia di Roma*, in the first two volumes of which he has discussed the history of Rome down to the time of Pyrrhus, and while following out the lines laid down by Mommsen in the *Röemische Forschungen* has gone far beyond that great man in the scope of his work, comprehensiveness of treatment and importance of results.

It is the misfortune of modern Italian scholarship that it has been so completely eclipsed by the transalpine; and the paucity of men of the first rank in the present generation has caused the world of scholars to look with suspicion upon an Italian book. But here at

least is a man to be reckoned with, and whether his conclusions are accepted or rejected, they can not be ignored, and his material and methods must be studied with the utmost attention. Apparently the importance of his work has so far been overlooked except by a very few. This is natural and excusable, particularly in this country, where the prevailing attitude towards the work of Italians is illustrated by the fact that up to the middle of last February, this book, though issued in 1898 and 1899, had not been placed on the shelves of the library of one of our most famous universities.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the results of this latest investigation of the sources of our knowledge of early Roman history, our attention should be fixed upon a factor in the problem, not new by any means, but which has recently assumed much larger proportions than formerly, that is the control exercised over results obtained in other ways by archaeological and topographical discoveries. The increased importance of material of this kind finds an excellent illustration in the information which has come into our hands as a result of the systematic excavations carried on in the Forum and Comitium during the past two years and a half. It was to be expected that in the archaeological remains of these two spots—one the center of Roman political life, the other the center of all else—much would be found to help in tracing the course of development of the city itself, as it was marked in monuments of brick and stone, monuments which could hardly be falsified by succeeding generations.

In general too little attention has been paid to the reciprocal relations of topography and history. Due weight has been readily given to the influence of environment upon the development of the individual, but there has been a failure to recognize the direct bearing of topographical conditions upon the historical progress of a nation, and to see how much with regard to the latter may be inferred from the former. As a matter of fact, the discoveries made within a space twenty feet square at the edge of the Comitium have precipitated a violent struggle between those who accept the traditional account of the regal period and those who do not, and the final settlement of the questions raised by these discoveries may go a long way in determining our attitude toward that tradition. To be sure the problem suggested here is not purely topographical but involves other elements as well, and the point may be better illustrated in a very simple case by noting that topographical conditions prove at once that Livy's account of the settlement of many thousand Latins in the valley *ad Murciae* in the days of Ancus Martius, must be absolutely wrong.

In view of the certain additions which have been and will continue to be made to our knowledge of the material remains of ancient Rome, and the publication of so notable a book as that of Pais, no apology is necessary for directing our attention again to the credibility of early Roman history, and we can perhaps do no better than follow our new leader in a brief review of the character of some of the sources from which information as to the events of the early period is derived, and of some of these events themselves.

At the very outset one must note the strange contrast that exists between the remarkable amount of detailed information given us by the annalists and the comparatively late period at which they did their work. There is a still greater contrast between this elaborate history and that of other peoples at the same relative stage of development, like the peoples of the east and of the Greek cities. If we know so little of the history of Magna Graecia before the fourth century, how is it that we know so much about Rome in the eighth and seventh?

Now it is as certain as anything can be, that the literature and culture of the Romans were due to Greek influence, and, necessarily, that what is related of their early history must have been due in some way or other to the labors of Greek historiographers transferred to native channels. The earliest Roman annalist wrote in Greek in the time of Hannibal, which two facts are enough in themselves to suggest the source and character of his story. We are told expressly that those who first wrote the history of Rome were Greeks, and their interest in things barbarian and Roman arose as a result of the intercourse between Greeks and Romans in the fifth century, when the Siciliotes and inhabitants of the Greek cities in southern Italy were necessarily brought into contact with the rising power of Rome. But though the earliest notices go back so far, it was not until the third century that Greek historians seem to have busied themselves especially with Rome, and the reason for this is easy to see. When in that momentous struggle between Greek and barbarian which culminated in the defeat of Pyrrhus, it became plain to every one that the seat of empire had been removed across the Adriatic, the clever Greek read the signs of the times and fell at once to describing, with or without knowledge, the beginnings and history of this new power. The form in which their narratives were put forth, determined all subsequent conceptions of the early history of Rome.

When these Greeks and their earliest Roman followers attempted to write the history of the first centuries of Rome, what had they in the way of records? The statement often made by the writers

of the Ciceronian period, that all monumental records such as statues, laws and inscriptions of various sorts, had perished in the Gallic invasion, must be true for the most part, but supposing that some of these monuments were in existence—and the discovery of the old inscription and surrounding structures in the Forum proves that some did survive—it is hardly possible that they would have been used to any great extent in working out the history of the earliest times. The evidence of the few fragments that now remain from the early days agrees with what we should infer from arguments of another kind, in showing that, if there had been no destruction like that wrought by the Gauls, there would have been few monuments of a sort to afford reliable historical information of a remote period. There is therefore little account to be taken of matter outside of oral and written records. The banquet songs described by Cato were doubtless a familiar feature of daily life, but even without the distinct repudiation of Cicero and Livy, we should recognize at once their worthlessness as historical documents.

The *Annales Maximi* were according to Cato's statement a list of magistrates, prodigies, eclipses and the price of corn. But these meager lists can not have made up those eighty rolls which Cicero describes and which contained the history of the city from the beginning down to 133 B.C., and which were diffuse enough to contain Piso's story of Romulus's use of wine. These *Annales* were written out long after the beginning of Latin literature, and owed their form and much of their content to the annals of the Greeks. In Pais's words, "The little that we know of them reveals such a direct imitation of the Greek writers, such abundance of words, or as we might better say, such garrulity, as suited the chatter of barbers [*quelle ciancie di barbieri*] which Polybius censures in Sosilus and Chaerea, the historians of Hannibal, but which did not suit in any way the redaction of state documents, compiled at a tolerably early date." No fragment of the *Annales Maximi* in our possession belongs to a redaction earlier than the third century. In short, after Pais's keen critique, it is difficult to see in them anything but a second century creation, based on the tradition of the great Roman families, the works of early Greek historiographers, and the earliest Roman poets like Ennius, and we must recognize the fact that "these fragments which have come down to us have nothing to do with the most ancient pontifical tablets which were little more than an illustration of the calendar."

The influence of Ennius, Naevius and other early Roman poets, if such there were, in shaping the legendary history of the early period, has probably been greatly underestimated. It can be shown further,

that these poets drew their material for early times, as well as their inspiration from their Greek predecessors and contemporaries. It would be idle to discuss at length the characteristics of these Greeks who approached their subject with no intention or desire to learn the truth, but only to produce a skilfully constructed poem into which could be woven a vast mass of legend and myth, with the natural result that the product was characterized by pure imagination, duplication, and falsification. This compilation of the *Annales Maximi* during the second century, under the influence of the first Roman poets and annalists, gave rise to the formation of what is known as the "canonical" tradition of the origin and early history of the city, and this "canonical" form which was an attempt to correlate divergent accounts, seems to have been put into final shape by Varro in his systematization and arrangement of all existing knowledge.

Our own chief literary sources of information are three, Diodorus Siculus, Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The two latter give in general the accepted official version, while Diodorus is apt to present divergent accounts, and is usually credited with a greater degree of independent judgment. Nevertheless, the evidence of all three has practically no first hand value. The stream can not rise higher than its source.

Interesting illustrations of the way in which this early history was manufactured, abound on every hand. *Monumenta* of various sorts were made and attributed to the days of the Kings, as the lituus of Romulus, of which Cicero speaks in the *De Divinatione*¹: "So do not mention the lituus of Romulus which you say could not have been burned in the great fire;" and of which Plutarch says: "It was kept in the Capitol, but lost when Rome was taken by the Gauls; afterwards when the barbarians had quitted the city, it was found buried deep in ashes, untouched by the fire, whilst everything about it was destroyed and consumed." Pliny the Elder² describes the costume of statues of the time of Romulus and Numa, and says of the statues of the three Fates near the Rostra: "I should suppose that these and that of Attus Navius were the first erected in the time of Tarquinius Priscus, if it were not for the fact that the statues of the earlier kings were on the Capitol,"—although in a preceding chapter he had expressly stated that the first bronze statue at Rome was made from the property of Spurius Cassius. Livy tells³ how Romulus vowed the temple to Jupiter Stator in the battle between the Romans and Sabines, but in the tenth book⁴ he writes: "Meanwhile the Consul raising

¹ II. 80. ² N. H., XXXIV. 22-23. ³ I. 12, 6. ⁴ 36, 11.

his hands to heaven, in a clear voice so that he might be heard plainly, vowed a temple to Jupiter Stator, if the flight of the Roman line should be checked," and a little later¹ having noticed the discrepancy, he continues: "And in this battle a temple was vowed to Jupiter Stator, as Romulus had previously vowed one; but he had consecrated only a *fanum*, that is the site set apart for the temple." Varro, quoted by Macrobius,² speaks of seeing a bronze tablet on which was engraved a law with regard to intercalary months, said to have been passed in the year 472 B. C. The most trustworthy account, however, refers this legislation to the year 191 B. C.

We may compare also the epigraphic fabrication related by Suetonius in describing the prodigies that happened at the death of Caesar.³ A bronze tablet was found in the tomb where Capys was said to have been buried, on which was cut in Greek this prophecy: "When the bones of Capys shall be uncovered, a descendant of Julius shall be slain by the hands of his kinsmen, and soon afterwards avenged by great slaughter throughout Italy." And Suetonius continues: "The authority for this statement is Cornelius Balbus, a most intimate friend of Caesar, so that no one is to suppose it fabulous or fictitious."

To what extent etymology was made to serve the purposes of the historiographer, may be seen on every page of Varro's famous work *De Lingua Latina*, of which the following is a notorious and most instructive example:

"Various reasons are assigned for the name Aventine. According to Naevius, it was derived from *avis*, because the birds came there from the Tiber; according to others the Alban king Aventinus was buried there; and according to others still the word was derived from *adventus hominum* because on that hill the temple of Diana was erected which was a common sanctuary of the Latins."

"I prefer the derivation *ad advectu*, because formerly this hill was separated from the rest by marshes, and therefore people were brought thither from the city on rafts."

The manner in which topographical conditions and facts were utilized is illustrated by the tale found in Ovid, Valerius Maximus and Pliny, to the effect that the horns cut in the arch of the Porta Raudusculana in the Servian wall, commemorated the curious experience of a certain Roman praetor, Cipus Genucius, from whose head sprang such horns, as he was leading his army through this gate.

We can understand the direct and formal imitation of Greek models better if we keep in mind the famous definition of Quintilian⁴:

¹ X. 37, 15.

² I. 13, 21.

³ *Jul. Caes.* 81.

⁴ X. 1, 31.

"historia . . . est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum et scribitur ad narrandum non ad probandum." From form to matter is but a step, and the process is the same as that illustrated so distinctly in the domain of art. The Romans compared themselves to the Greeks long before Plutarch wrote his *Lives*, and they invented incidents in the careers of their heroes which should correspond to those of famous Greeks. Thus Scipio Africanus was said to have owed his birth to a miracle similar to that which brought Alexander the Great into being, and Tarquinius Superbus copied the procedure of Periander. The inevitable result was that the euhemerism of Ennius destroyed almost all of the germs of native mythology and theogony, and indicated the lines along which Roman historiography must move.

Furthermore, as the Romans themselves tell us, all their historians down to the time of Pompey belonged to distinguished families by relationship or clientage, and this very fact caused them to be at pains to exalt the history of their own clans, a fruitful source of fabrication. But there was another influence at work, and that was the desire to exalt the whole state, and its history. Hence the determined effort to give official sanction to the tradition that the Romans came of Trojan or Hellenic stock, and that they could trace their origin to a time as early as any of the Greek cities.

Two other factors in the formation of this artificial structure, the received story of the early days, were the duplication of events actual or alleged, and the influence of current political tendencies and theories. The duplication of events, that is the assigning of what happened at one time to another much earlier date, in either the same or a slightly disguised form, while not peculiar to Roman history, has there found its widest application. It is not among the least of Pais's services that he has brought out with proper emphasis the great importance of this factor. So numerous are the examples, such as the repeated stories of Manlius, and the explanations of the Lacus Curtius, that it would be useless to linger over them. The reasons for such duplication are patent at the first glance, among them the stereotyped character and conduct of those who belonged to the same house, the desire of succeeding generations to imitate the deeds of their ancestors, and the fact that so many of the clans seem to have assumed in successive years the command against the same foes. Variations in later versions seem usually to have been intentionally made, in order that suspicion might be averted. Consulships, dictatorships and censorships were boldly attributed to the ancestors of those who had held these offices in historical times, and so notorious was the practice that even Cicero and Livy protested

against it. In consequence of this same impulse, events of a later date were thrown back into earlier periods, as the fabled treaty of 508 B.C. between Rome and Carthage, and the establishment of the censorship in the days of Servius Tullius. The same tendency which has assigned to Charlemagne the achievements of more than one man produced such types as Appius Claudius and Coriolanus.

The last factor in the fabrication of Roman history upon which much weight must be laid, is that of the political attitude of the historian and his hero. Cato, as is well known, tried to do something to counteract this evil, by refusing to mention the names of those of whom he was writing, but nothing could have been farther from the purpose of all other Roman historians. One has only to read Livy's account of perfectly historical persons and events, to see how he deliberately warped or suppressed the truth in order to depreciate the services of those who represented opposite political views. Modern colorless critical history was something entirely unguessable to the Roman mind. Education in morals and good citizenship, the avowed object of the Roman historian, demanded an expression on his part of what he considered right and patriotic, and a condemnation of the opposite. To the most critical and truth-seeking of Romans, even a writer like Froude would have seemed not only culpably impartial but absolutely impossible.

These elements have been recognized in some degree by all historians since Niebuhr, but the extent of their application has varied. We have in general come to regard the history of the regal period as legendary so far as details are concerned, but no such view has prevailed with regard to the republic. It is true that Mommsen in his *Roemische Forschungen* laid down the lines along which the investigation should proceed, and in his essays on Coriolanus, Spurius Maelius, Spurius Cassius and Marcus Manlius, demonstrated the non-historical character of many of the tales from the period of the early republic, but in these particular cases, the subjects were such as would most naturally be derived from mythical sources. Neither in his history nor in his essays, does Mommsen cast any serious doubt upon the truth of the main features of the traditional history of the period between the expulsion of the Kings and the fall of the decemvirate. The attitude of most scholars previous to 1898, may be illustrated by that of Pelham and Shuckburgh in their histories published in 1893 and 1894. Pelham, after explaining the reasons why the history of the early republic is subject to some extent to the same suspicions as that of the regal period, and stating that the "details are of no historical value," proceeds to relate the

course of events in such a way as not to suggest for a moment that he discredits the main features of the narrative. Shuckburgh is much less skeptical and gives his readers to understand that he is treating of what is genuinely historical.

Hardened as we have become to the process of having long cherished beliefs destroyed, and prone as we are to welcome innovations in all things, we can not overcome a sense of dismay at reading statements like these of Pais :

"We arrive therefore at the conclusion that the whole account of the decemvirate, that is the creation of this magistracy, the sending of the embassy to Athens, the codification of the laws of the Twelve Tables, the circumstances and procedure with reference to Virginia, no less than the second secession of the plebs, the following passage of the Canuleian laws, and the revolution at Ardea, are the results of unskilful attempts to combine self-contradictory traditions, and have at bottom no historical or chronological value."

"In the case of all the history of Roman legislation before the decemvirate we are confronted with accounts not originally true and only altered by later changes, but produced by real and deliberate falsification."

"The pretended constitutional history of Rome, described by the annalists of the second and first centuries, is in direct opposition to the honest and sincere declaration of Polybius who asserted that it was difficult to explain the beginnings and successive modifications, and to foretell the future phases of the Roman constitution, since the institutions of the past, both private and public, were unknown."

This means that everything which has been handed down from the years before 440 B. C. is thoroughly discredited, and that the beginning of anything like genuine history must be placed after that date. It is doubtful if anything quite so destructive as this in the field of historical criticism has been effected for many years, and we are overpowered by the almost absolute negation involved. Pains-taking labor and the utmost skill in the employment of great learning, have combined to produce a monumental work of the greatest importance, and one which forces itself upon the attention of all students of classical antiquity.

Process and results are precisely the same for both the regal and early republican periods, but let us look rather at the latter and examine briefly two or three of the main features in the narrative which has come down to us. Perhaps the most noteworthy event in the twenty years after the expulsion of the Kings, was the secession of the plebs to the Sacred Mount, which marked the culmination of the first stage in the struggle between plebeian and patrician, and resulted in the establishment of that most unique of Roman institutions, the tribuneship. The circumstances are familiar to all, how in the midst of wars with Aequians and Volscians, the plebs

were put off again and again with false promises, until after the army had won a victory under the dictator Manius Valerius, and was encamped before the city, the Senate still refused to adopt the necessary reforms. Thereupon the army, by which we must suppose the plebeian part of it to be meant, marched in order to the Sacred Mount, or according to another version to the Aventine, and returned to the city only after their claims had been allowed, in part at least, and the tribuneship established. Half a century later, another secession is described. The decemvirs had refused to give up office, and had, it was alleged, caused Lucius Siccius Dentatus, a veteran of many campaigns, to be foully murdered, while the most notorious of the board, Appius Claudius, had by his attempt to carry off Virginia, forced her father to slay her in defense of honor. The army again marched to the Sacred Mount, nominated tribunes, advanced to Rome and occupied the Aventine. A compromise was negotiated by Valerius and Horatius, and the tribunate again established.

Now the very similarity of these two accounts is enough to arouse grave suspicion, and an investigation of all the attendant circumstances proves that the first secession is but an anticipation of the second, together with some features which repeat the story of the expulsion of the Kings. Thus of the two leaders in the secession, Lucius Junius Brutus and Caius Sicinius, the latter is but the duplication of C. Sicinius, one of the tribunes elected after the fall of the decemvirate, and both these again of that Sicinius who was tribune in 395 B. C., and after the taking of Veii proposed to emigrate thither from Rome and found a new state. The names of the tribunes, either when the establishment of the tribunate in 494 is spoken of, or the increase in their number in 471, or the reestablishment of the institution in 449, show by their identity or similarity, that they represent only repetitions and variations of the same tradition, and that the successive Sicinii or Siccii—for these appear to be variants of the same name—Icili, etc., are due to this process of duplication. So Manius Valerius who pacified the plebs in 494 before the first secession, is the same person, and the occasion the same, that we find described in Livy,¹ where he tells how in 342 the dictator M. Valerius Corvus checked the rage of the army by his eloquence, and again of the same occurrence in 302 or 300. In this latter year, moreover, this same Valerius, when Consul, caused the famous "*lex de provocatione*" to be again approved, which had been already passed twice in previous years, and always on the motion of members of this same family. That is, during the first

¹ VII. 39.

two hundred years of the republic, the passage of the same measure was attributed to the efforts of the same family thrice, which means, of course, that the annalists who wrote under the inspiration of the Valerii, thrust this action of theirs further and further back.

Let us pass over a half century, and take up the narrative of the decemvirate itself. The preceding contests between patricians and plebeians, the chaos resulting from the clashing of Consul and tribune, the sending of an embassy to Athens to learn something of the procedure of the Greeks, the appointment of a board of ten men for the year 451, who should supersede all regular constitutional magistrates and themselves discharge all executive, legislative and judicial functions while engaged in codifying Roman law, the reappointment of this board for the ensuing year although with considerable change in its personnel, the growth of tyranny and the personal ascendancy of Appius Claudius, the illegal refusal on the part of the decemvirs to surrender office at the end of the year and high-handed proceedings in maintaining their position, the murder of Siccius Dentatus, the story of Virginia, the second secession of the plebs, and the consequent fall of the decemvirs and the reestablishment of consular and tribunician government, make up the framework of this story into which is woven a mass of details familiar enough.

At the outset we are met by two and perhaps three distinct traditions which as usual are not only different but irreconcilable. According to the received version, the decemvirs prepared only ten tables during the first year, and were continued in office in order to complete their work, but failing to do so, the last two tables were promulgated by Valerius and Horatius, Consuls in 449 and outspoken defenders of the rights of the plebeians. But this same version states that the law against intermarriage between the two orders was not repealed until 445 through the action of the tribune Canuleius, and by the law, called after him. How was it that Valerius and Horatius did not allow this privilege when they revised and completed the Twelve Tables? Furthermore, according to the received version, there were at least three plebeians among the decemvirs in the second year. How was it that they agreed to the perpetuation of this restriction which is represented as being one of the chief grounds of complaint among the plebeians?

It is evident that the account of this Canuleian law belonged originally to a version of the decemvir story entirely different from that which ascribed to them a bad character, or reckoned plebeians among their number for the second year, and which became afterwards canonical. If the plebeians had been represented among the decemvirs, they would never have submitted to the continuance of

this provision against intermarriage or the subsequent ineligibility of plebeians to hold office. Again, from a reference to Canuleius in Florus it would appear that one version was current, according to which Canuleius was the leader of the plebeians in another secession from the city, this time to the Janiculum. The accepted version then, according to which there were either three or five plebeians among the decemvirs during the second year, who became as tyrannical and ill-disposed towards their fellows as Appius Claudius himself with whom they were most closely associated, involves the highly improbable assumption that they joined with the patricians in putting forth legislation inimical to the interests of their own class, and that after having succeeded in winning so large a proportional representation upon this wholly extraordinary board of magistrates, they consented to be shut out of the consulship for the next three quarters of a century.

That there were other versions, however, dating from an earlier period, seems to be clearly shown by the account of Diodorus, according to whom it was provided in the last two tables, prepared by Valerius and Horatius, that one of the consuls must be a plebeian and both might be. Now it is perfectly certain that this stage in the struggle was not reached before the passage of the Licinian laws in 367, or their extension in 342, so that this version is manifestly the result of anticipation.

A similar confusion in the sources, so-called, is illustrated by the fact that those annalists who ascribed the last two tables to the decemvirs, also attributed to them the insertion of intercalary months, although this action was assigned by others to Romulus, to Numa, to Servius, or to the Consuls of 472.

The Valerio-Horatian laws of 449 were really a part of the story of the decemvirate, and contained, it was said, three principal provisions: first, that no magistrate should be elected from whose judgment there could be no right of appeal to the people; second, that the decisions of the *comitia tributa*, meaning thereby an assembly of the plebeians by tribes, should be binding upon the whole people; and third, that the persons of the tribunes should be inviolable. The first of these provisions was enacted in the year 300 by a Valerius, and Livy states that this was the third time that it had been passed, on each occasion through the instrumentality of a Valerius. The second was said to have been already passed in 471, and to have been presented again in 339 and 287, when by the Hortensian law the step was actually taken. With regard to the last, hopeless confusion prevailed. Livy said that in his time lawyers denied that inviolability was the result of this enactment, and the view that

the aediles were also made *sacrosancti* by this law, is proved to be absurd by the entire absence of any such condition in later times. In Livy's account also, the *decemviri iudices* are mentioned along with the tribunes and aediles, as having been made *sacrosancti*, but these decemvirs can be no other than the board which was afterwards known as *decemviri stlitibus indicandis*, who had nothing to do with the decemvirs, and never had the slightest claim to inviolability. It is impossible to suppose that those who invented the Valerio-Horatian laws of 449, should have attributed to them the establishment of another decemvirate like the one just overthrown.

The leading figure in the story of the decemvirs, whose lust was the immediate cause of their expulsion, is represented as Appius Claudius, but he is found to be no more truly historical than his predecessors.

"All the Claudii, according to tradition, pursued the same course of political action. All were haughty and open enemies of the plebeians, going to extreme lengths in their opposition to them and always arrogant. This tradition, however, has been shown to be untrue. The Claudii, especially Appius Claudius Caecus, censor in 312, were people of culture, of progressive ideas, looking with favor upon popular tendencies and assisting the plebs, and it is easy to understand why they were described in the annals of their enemies as tyrannical. Furthermore all the Appii Claudii who made their appearance in Roman affairs before 312 are stereotyped characters. The first Claudius, according to the received family tradition, came to Rome in the first years after the expulsion of the Kings, but soon after his reception among the senators, displayed his hatred for the plebs. His descendants exhibit the same tendency; Appius Claudius, consul in 471, was accused by the tribunes Siccius and Duilius, and escaped punishment by suicide in precisely the same way as the hated decemvir of whom he is naturally the double. For this same reason, tradition said that during his consulship and in spite of his opposition various popular measures were passed. In 424 and 416 a Claudius recalls the decemvir; and C. Claudius who in 450 opposed the plebs and the Canuleian rogation acted in the same way as the celebrated censor.

"We are told that this latter, when the time arrived for him to give up office, wished to remain, desiring to accomplish many great reforms; that he gave the sons of freedmen entrance into the Senate, and in order that he might not be forced to render an account of his actions, avoided the meetings of the Senate. This is practically the same thing which that earlier C. Claudius did, who when his colleague P. Valerius had been killed during the siege of the Capitol which had been seized by Appius Herdonius, took pains to prevent the election of a second colleague, and distracted the attention of the people with games, processions and amusements. Finally it is quite probable that some of the marked features of the legend of the censor Appius were taken from the deeds of the later Claudii, especially the censor of the year 169, who in a celebrated case, when he had been accused by the tribunes, came within a very little of being condemned."¹

¹ Ettore Pais, *La Storia di Roma*, I. 1, pp. 567-569.

The names of the other decemvirs show their unhistorical character. Among the patricians, the family of Romilius, said to have been Consul in 455, is otherwise unknown; that of Rabuleius is nowhere mentioned among the patrician gentes or in the Fasti, and the only other Rabuleius of this early period was a tribune of the plebs in the time of Spurius Cassius. Lucius Minucius belongs with Spurius Maelius who is universally recognized as purely mythical, and after 457 there was no trace of any Minucius until the plebeian of that name became Consul in 305. It is strange to find an Antonius mentioned among the patricians in the fifth century, as the Antonii appeared first as tribunes in 167, and no one of the family was Consul until 92. With regard to the patrician Sestius, it is to be noted that the only other Sestius in the consular Fasti was the famous first plebeian Consul of 366, who was elected to that office in consequence of the Licinian-Sestian laws, and as their provisions were by some annalists assigned to corresponding legislation immediately after the fall of the decemvirate, it was natural to insert a Sestius among the members of that board.

With regard to the Consuls in the year after the expulsion of the decemvirs, Valerius and Horatius, the case is still more striking. The Horatii figure as Consuls in the years 509, 477, 457 and 447, but after this date there is no authentic record of an Horatius among Roman magistrates. The Valerii who appear with the Horatii in this period are only anticipations of the historical members of the family, and the Valerii and Horatii taken together, may be regarded as myths, corresponding to Lycurgus, Theseus and Zaleucus, who occupy the same relative positions in the historical development of Sparta, Athens and Locris. Later rationalism transformed these possible divinities into the two first Roman Consuls, and their appearance after the fall of the decemvirate and the new dawn of liberty for the plebs is a precise analogue to their appearance after the expulsion of the Kings and the bringing in of liberty for the whole people.

With regard to the character of the legislation of the Twelve Tables it must be noted that what has been handed down to us, gives evidence of legal conditions belonging to a period much later than the middle of the fifth century. There was said to have been a statute forbidding the burial of the dead within the city, but according to Servius this law was not passed until 260, in the consulship of Duilius. The making of wills was provided for, although in Sparta, a correspondingly conservative state, no such legislation occurred before the fourth century. Binding force is said to have been given to marriage without the ceremony of *confarreatio*, or

coemptio, although such laxity can hardly have been allowed so early, and an institution like the "*trinoctium*," or provision by which a wife, by staying three nights in each year away from home, could avoid coming "*in manum mariti*," appears wholly foreign to Roman ideas in the fifth century. Witness the evidence of the legend of Spurius Cassius who is represented as having no property of his own except the *peculium*. The coining of copper money is known not to have been begun until the middle of the fourth century, but the terms employed in the fragments of the Twelve Tables seem to point indubitably to such coinage.

The legislation of the Twelve Tables must, according to all antecedent probability, have been the result of slow growth, and its traditional form the result of the fusing of various redactions. For it is *a priori* unreasonable to suppose that any such codification, as these Tables are represented as being, should have been made once for all at so early a period. As Athens attributed to Solon a mass of later legislation, so Rome attributed to the decemvirs much that was of later origin. Lycurgus in Sparta, Carondas and Zaleucus in Magna Graecia, and Diocles in Syracuse, illustrate the same process.

The true view, that the legislation of the Twelve Tables comprises in substance the legal development of the fourth century, finds support in the narrative of Appius Claudius, the censor in 312, and Gnaeus Flavius, the scribe of the pontifices, who was raised to the office of curule aedile by the help of Appius. As has already been pointed out, the decemvir was developed from the character and deeds of the censor, and, furthermore, an examination of the work of Flavius has frequently suggested the correspondence between it and that of the decemvirs. "The latter formulated and published the civil law, and freed the citizens from the abuse of the magistrates and unskilful lawyers, the former by publishing the formulas of this law and the list of days for transacting legal business, arrived at the same result. To the decemvirs was attributed the formation of that calendar which Flavius published." So in Cicero's time there was a dispute as to whether Flavius lived before or after the promulgation of the laws of the decemvirs, and some asserted that what he published was afterwards withdrawn from the knowledge of the people. The confusion arising from this double tradition—the publication of the results of the decemviral legislation by the board itself or the succeeding consuls, or by Flavius in 305—gave rise to the further version according to which rights once in possession of the people were afterwards taken from them. The real publication of the Fasti in 305 appears therefore to have been one of the causes for the formation of a story of a corresponding publication at the time

of the decemvirs, and one more link in the chain of evidence against their actual existence.

Once more, according to another version, the publication of the Twelve Tables was said to have been entrusted to the plebeian aediles, although it is manifestly absurd to suppose that so important a matter should have been placed in the hands of minor plebeian officials at so early a date. Careful analysis seems to show that the tradition of the presence of plebeians among the decemvirs, is due to the confusion of the different sorts of decemvirs, *decemviri agris adsignandis*, *solibus indicandis* and *legibus scribundis*, and that their insertion in the last is due to their presence in historical times in the second. The proposal to burn the decemvirs is another form of the tale related by Valerius Maximus, in which the tribune Mucius burns his nine colleagues and the history of the turmoil and agitation during the decade between the supposed Terentilian rogation and the decemvirate, is only the duplication of what happened in the decade preceding the enactment of the Licinian laws of 367, which were sometimes identified with those of 449.

Another element in the traditional history of the decemvirate, namely the embassy to Athens, upon close examination proves to be as unhistorical as the rest of the story. In the first place, how is it possible that the names of these ambassadors could have been remembered so exactly, when in Cicero's time men were not sure of the names of those who were sent out in the year 146 to assist Memmius in the reorganization of the province of Greece. The explanation is that Postumii, Sulpicii and Manlii were ambassadors to Greece in the third century, and hence members of these same families were said to have taken part in the first embassy. In the second place, the story of the sending of an embassy to Athens on such an errand, was a result of that same tendency among the historiographers of the two countries to prove the parallelism of their institutions, or at least the imitation of the Greek by the Roman. The choice of the best of Greek legal principles seemed to them a thoroughly characteristic thing for the Romans to make. The relations existing between Athens, the Greek cities in Italy, and Rome, were of such a nature that it would be to Athens that such an embassy would naturally be sent, and the fact that Roman law was anything but an imitation of the Greek was quite lost sight of in the general desire to connect the two peoples in every possible way. To sum up in the words of Professor Pais:

"The story of the decemvirate . . . which we have seen to be false on its external side is no more authentic with regard to its essential or in-

ternal character, and the natural consequence is that the whole account is to be rejected in its entirety as a later invention.

"The pseudo-history from the expulsion of the Kings to the fall of the decemvirs and the conspiracy of Spurius Maelius, consists of two or three parts which are repeated. To the Sabine invasions and the continual wars with Volscians and Aequians, correspond the popular agitations which led to the secessions of 494 and 450, and the creation of tribunes in 493, 471 and 449. All these varying acts in the drama are the result of the simple duplication of the same event."

For the period after the decemvirate and down to the sack of Rome by the Gauls, this rigid criticism discloses a similar chaotic condition of tradition, and it is only gradually, even in this fourth century, that we begin to find trustworthy and accurate historical data.

If now this view of the tradition of the history of Rome for the first three or four centuries be justified, what answers can be given to the two questions that at once present themselves, *i. e.*, Is any credence to be given to any part of this tradition? and What process is to be employed in attempting to separate the true from the false? The answers made to these two questions will condition the method to be followed in reconstructing early Roman history, which is simply the recognized method of modern historical criticism.

As all know, great activity has been displayed during recent years in studying the so-called sources of Roman history, those earlier annalists from whom Diodorus, Dionysius, and Livy and their successors drew much of their information, and attempts have been made to assign relative historical value to these sources. Great critical acumen has been developed in these investigations, but the data are necessarily so meager in most cases, and the temptation to skilful combination and bold hypothesis so great, that one feels an instinctive distrust of the dogmatic conclusions of even the most learned scholars. Not that something has not been really accomplished, and we may, for instance, feel reasonably sure that Diodorus is on the whole more likely to have used better sources than Dionysius, but after all the difference is comparatively slight. In view of the many varying accounts of the events of Rome's early history, the mere fact that one version can be traced to one annalist rather than another, is in itself and usually, no valid reason for believing that it is true, and the answer to the first question may be prefaced by the statement that because *any* particular narrative is told by *any* particular annalist, is in itself no sufficient reason for its acceptance. This acceptance or rejection must rest on other grounds. On the other hand, it is absurd to assume that *all* of this tradition is necessarily false. Such wholesale rejection would be as

irrational as entire and unquestioning acceptance, for it is manifestly impossible, according to the ordinary laws of chance, that some truth should not have entered into the narrative. The answer, therefore, to the first question must necessarily be in the affirmative, and we are immediately confronted with the second, which is infinitely more difficult.

We may, of course, assume an entirely agnostic position, and maintain that it is impossible to discover data sufficient to enable us to unravel the tangled threads of truth and fiction. Or we may take the position that there is some method by which an approximation at least to the truth may be made. This is the only reasonable attitude, and the method of approach must be, briefly, the following. We are in the presence of numerous conflicting versions of early events. One series has obtained wider currency and authority, because it received in antiquity the stamp of "canonicity," and the others have been cast aside for the most part as of less value. This view must be entirely abandoned at the very outset, and all versions from every source admitted as having equal validity. Then, so far as possible, the genesis of each version must be traced out, and its relation in time and place to the others determined, regardless of any preconceived superiority of one over another. This determination of genesis, time and place, and interrelation will in most cases be quite indefinite, but it is imperative that the first step in the process be the assembling of *all* traditional matter with such determinants as can be found. Having this material before us, we proceed to select, accept or reject, not according to any theory of the superior credibility of one supposed source over another, but as a result of the application of principles of criticism that have been derived from other sources of knowledge, that is the testimony and test of archaeological evidence, topographical conditions, comparative law, philology and religion, and the known laws of historical development. For it may be taken for granted that no nation develops and decays in a manner wholly peculiar to itself. Out of this traditional material much will be rejected at once because it cannot be reconciled with the testimony of one or another of the criteria just mentioned. In many cases only one version will be found which corresponds with this testimony, and it may be accepted provisionally. Some cases will occur where two or more versions are equally admissible according to the standards which have been adopted, and as there is no means of coming to a decision between them, historical value must be denied them all,—so far at least as basing any further inferences on them is concerned. The application of this method to the mass of literary tradition, will

leave little in the way of details that can be accepted as trustworthy, but to this little can be added the constantly increasing amount of information as to the gradual course of development, which is supplied by these very fields of research, archaeology, topography, law and religion.

If we are obliged to give up the entertaining details of literary story, we get in their place the infinitely more important and useful general testimony of more trustworthy witnesses. The assumption that it is possible, out of the literature itself, to separate the true from the false, seems to me to have been a fundamental error in many attempts to reconstruct early Roman history, for in the very nature of the case, the judgment must rest in a large part upon an entirely unmeasurable quantity,—the varying conception of historical aim and method held by the Greek and Roman annalists.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

STUDIES IN THE SOURCES OF THE SOCIAL REVOLT IN 1381¹

I-IV.

SOME valuable new sources of the history of the rising in 1381 have recently been published.² These, together with the much larger number of others already available, afford ample material for the solution of most of the important problems connected with that attempted revolution. It is the purpose of the following paper to show the need of a thorough revision of the generally accepted account of some of its best known events in the light of all published sources, the old as well as the new. The incidents selected are the two chief crises of the revolt, *viz.*, the conferences between the King and the insurgents at Mile End and Smithfield respectively. The investigation will include the consequences of these interviews, that is to say, the killing of Tyler, the chief leader, and the dispersal of the insurgents, and will involve a discussion of the two sets of demands granted them, showing conclusively the economic and religious character of the revolt.

¹The usual title of the *Peasants' Rising* is rejected because the peasants were not the only factor of the movement. Among other factors were: the lower classes of the towns, in some cases the municipal governments; there was a general uprising of mesne towns and tenants against the monasteries and similar corporations. In general, it was an uprising of the lower classes against the upper, with a view to changing existing social conditions, and may be appropriately termed a *Social Revolt*.

The author desires to express his deep obligation to Professor John Matthews Manly, of the University of Chicago, for invaluable advice and assistance rendered in the preparation of these *Studies*.

²Powell, E., *The Rising in East Anglia in 1381*. Cambridge, 1896. Contains a good general sketch of the revolt in Suffolk, Norfolk and Cambridgeshire, with the poll tax lists for 1381 for Suffolk, a valuable appendix of unpublished jury indictments, and an extract from a chronicle of Abbey St. Edmund's. The latter chronicle, together with other materials, will be found in the third vol. of *Annals or Memorials of St. Edmundsbury*, ed. Th. Arnold (Rolls Series). A very important chronicle among the sources is an extract "*Oute of an anonimale cronicle belonging to the abbey of St. Maries in Yorke*," ed. G. M. Trevelyan, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII., 509-522, which was faithfully and extensively used by Stowe in his *Annales*. Another recent contribution is Réville, A., *Le Soulèvement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre en 1381* (Paris, 1898), containing, besides many Coram Regerolls and ancient indictments, an account of the revolt in Herts, Suffolk and Norfolk, by the author, and an excellent general sketch of the movement by the editor, Charles Petit-Dutaillis. G. M. Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe* contains a valuable chapter on the Peasant's Rising. Cf. also James Tait's article on Wat Tyler in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and the lately published *Patent Rolls*, 4 and 5 Richard II. Powell and Trevelyan have just published a small volume entitled *The Peasants' Rising and the Lollards*, containing, along with other matters, certain trials passed over by Réville, but used by Trevelyan.

The charming narrative of John Richard Green best embodies the traditional view of the meeting of the King and the people at Mile End:

"On the morning of the 14th therefore, Richard rode from the Tower to Mile End, to meet the Essex men. 'I am your king and lord, good people,' the boy began with the fearlessness which marked his bearing throughout the crisis, 'what will you?' 'We will that you free us forever,' shouted the peasants, 'us and our lands, and that we be never named nor held for serfs.' 'I grant it,' replied Richard; and he bade them go home, pledging himself at once to issue charters of freedom and amnesty. A shout of joy welcomed the promise. Throughout the day more than thirty clerks were busy writing letters of pardon and emancipation, and with these, the mass of the Essex men and the men of Hertfordshire withdrew quietly to their homes."¹

This extract is based entirely on Froissart, being simply an abbreviation of his narrative, which is too long to be here quoted in full. To the same source may be traced the description of this scene by other modern authorities in so far as they attempt to give details.

Let us examine the other contemporary chronicles recording this event. One of them, a fragment of a chronicle preserved by Stowe,² gives an even more detailed account than Froissart. In this source, however, the conference consists of an interview between the King and Wat Tyler, without any of the charming dialogue forming the basis of Froissart's account. Tyler presents a definite series of demands which the King grants in full, after which he retires to the Tower Royal, while the insurgents return to the city to carry out his grant to behead all traitors, wherever they may be found. The other contemporary chronicle in which the event is recorded, a reputed life of Richard II. by an unknown monk of Evesham,³ varies even more from the account of Froissart. It represents the boy King as being summoned to Mile End under threats of death, and riding timidly to the place of meeting. "Like a lamb among wolves seemed he, as one in great dread of his life, and meekly he entreated the people standing about."⁴ The proceedings consisted of an interview between leaders delegated by the insurgents and the King, who was only too glad to grant whatever they demanded and obtain their permission to retire.

No other contemporary chronicles or public documents contain mention of the King's reputed bravery at Mile End, although the demands he granted are elsewhere recorded. Froissart is the sole authority for this attitude. This lack of confirmation speaks against

¹ Green, *Hist. English People*, I. 473. His source is Froissart, IX. 404-406.

² *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII. 517 ff.

³ *Historia Vitae et Regni Ricardi II, Angliae Regis, a Monacho quodam de Evesham consignata*, ed. Th. Hearnius, Oxoniae, 1729.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 21-28.

the incident as recorded by Froissart, and its contradiction by two contemporary sources certainly make necessary a careful investigation. This has not been attempted by the latest modern authorities.¹ As Froissart has furnished the basis of this traditional account of the meeting at Mile End, as well as, in great part, of the death of Tyler at Smithfield, and indeed, of other important incidents of the revolt, we shall begin these studies with an investigation of the value of his *Chronicles* as a source of history.

I. THE CREDIBILITY OF FROISSART.²

The *Chronicles* of Sir John Froissart are a sort of compendium of European history of his own times³ and those immediately preceding, grouped about the central theme of the wars between England and France in the fourteenth century.⁴ They are divided into four books, of which we are mainly concerned with the second extending from 1378 till 1385, although the conclusions reached will apply in a measure to the whole work.

Even during Froissart's lifetime the work was so popular as to require several editions. There is, however, no considerable diversity of text in the editions of that part of Book II. concerned with the revolt in 1381.⁵ The citations of this article will be in the main

¹ Petit-Dutaillis, in Réville, *Soulèvement*, vii., viii.; Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, 234-235.

² Much has been written on Froissart as a historian, but it is of a general nature and throws little light on his value as a source of history: Kervyn, I. Pt. II., Ch. 30; Luce, I. CVII., CXXVI.; Darmesteter, Ch. 23.

³ The materials for the life of Froissart are to be found chiefly in his two poems, *L'Espinette Amoureuse* and *Le Joli Buisson de Jonece* (Scheler's edition), in stray notices of the *Chronicles* and in records published mainly by Pinchart, *La Cour de Jeanne et de Wenceslas*. Suffice it here to say that he was born in 1337, devoted most of his life to poetry and history, and died in the early 15th century, possibly in 1410. The reader is especially referred to Kervyn's edition of the *Chronicles*, I. Pt. I., for the most complete modern biography. Cf. also Introduction to Scheler's edition of the poems; Paulin Paris vs. Kervyn de Lettenhove, *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, XIV. 851-875; 1237 ff; 1249 ff; 1316 ff., 1350. An excellent brief sketch of part of his life is given by Professor G. L. Kittredge, "Chaucer and Froissart" in Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, XXVI. 325-327. Brief accounts will also be found in the French literary histories of Aubertin and Petit de Julleville, as well as in Buchon's first edition of Froissart (by de la Curne de St. Palaye), and in Johnes's translation. Mme. Darmesteter's popular biography (translated by Miss E. Frances Poynter, N. Y., 1895) and two articles by G. B. Macauley in *Macmillan's* (1895, I. 223-230, 194-200) are interesting reading, but hardly scientific.

⁴ His own title was *Chroniques de France, d'Angleterre, d'Escoce, de Bretagne, d'Espagne, d'Italie, de Flandres et d'Allemagne*.

⁵ According to Kervyn there are three editions of Book II. extant, of which he prefers the third, based on a MS. belonging to the University of Leyden; *Chroniques*, ed. Kervyn, I. Pt. II., 104 ff., 141-142, 363-381. From certain additional matter given in Johnes's translation, it would seem that there was a fourth edition now lost. *Ibid.*, 373-381.

to the excellent modern edition of Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, the most detailed and as yet the only completed edition.¹ English quotations will be given where practicable in the quaint language of Lord Berners's translation,² which best reproduces the flavor of the original.

Few chroniclers of the Middle Age were better qualified for historical work than Froissart. His mental faculties, naturally vigorous, were improved by a school education extending well-nigh to his twentieth year,³ and by a practical training in association with men of affairs which it was impossible for the usual chronicler, a cloistered monk, to enjoy. He added to these a talent for facile expression which has made his *Chronicles* one of the classics of Middle French literature.

Few chroniclers made more diligent and honest preparation for their work than did Froissart, according to the light he possessed. For with him it was indeed a lifework. At the age of twenty he began an historical account of the battle of Poitiers which he presented to his countrywoman Isabella of Hainault, wife of Edward III.⁴ During the five years of his sojourn at the English court as clerk of the Queen's chamber, he constantly found time, amidst other duties, to obtain information from the warriors and statesmen with whom he came in contact. Diplomatic missions on which he was sent, even to distant countries, furthered his historical preparation.⁵ For even then he was recognized as one preparing for important historical work, and was given many facilities of information.⁶ This was much more the case after the appearance of the first Book of his *Chronicles*. In the long journeys which he was then enabled to take for the sole purpose of obtaining historical information,⁷ he

¹ Brussels, 1870-1872, for the Royal Academy of Belgium, 25 vols., 15 of the text, 10 of various aids to the study. With painstaking researches on all the MSS., the various editions being published in full. Another good modern edition is that for the Société de l'Histoire de France, begun in 1869 by Siméon Luce and continued since his death by M. Gaston Raynaud. J. A. C. Buchon's editions of Froissart in modern orthography are antiquated.

² First published 1523-1525, reprinted 1812. Thomas Johnes's translation. (Hafod, 1802-1805, repr. 1874) is fairly accurate, though why authorities like Stubbs and Trevelyan should cite it in preference to the original French, I fail to see.

³ *Chroniques*, XIV. 2. Cf. the charming account of his youthful education in *L'Espinet Amoureuse* (ed. Scheler), I. 251 ff.

⁴ *Chroniques*, II. 5.

⁵ He thus traveled in Scotland (*ibid.*, II. 137-138; V. 133; XIII. 219, 256), Aquitaine (XVI. 234; XV. 142), and in Italy as far as Rome (*Joli Buisson de Jonece*, 341-347; *Dit du Florin*, 221-223), besides other countries.

⁶ For example, at the birth of Richard II. at Bordeaux, the marshal of the Prince of Wales for Aquitaine bade Froissart record the event, furnishing him with the necessary details. XVI. 234.

⁷ E. g., his famous journey to Béarn, his second journey to Brittany, and others. *Œuvres*, ed. Kervyn, I. Pt. II., Chs. 22-23, 25-27.

was received by the powerful of different countries in a manner which leaves no doubt of their opinion of his historical work.¹

He has himself very prettily described these painstaking preparations:

"Much pains and labor did I have with my work, in many ways; so much so that I could never have compiled or finished it except by the labor of my head or the sacrifice of my body."²

Other passages tell of his love for the work and his resolve to devote his life to it:

"As long as I live, by the grace of God I shall continue it; for the more I follow it and labor thereon, the more it pleases me. Even as a gentle knight or esquire who loves arms, while preserving and continuing develops himself therein, thus do I, laboring and striving with this matter, improve and delight myself."³

He wrote not for his contemporaries alone, but for ages to come; like Thucydides he knew that his book would be *αἰγιόμας ἐς αἰεὶ*:

"For well I know that when I am dead and gone this noble and high history will be in great demand, and all noble and valiant men will take pleasure in it, thereby increasing their good deeds."⁴

Let us now examine more closely this method of acquiring information and its effects on the historical value of his chronicles. This was almost entirely by means of the interview. Now he certainly had excellent opportunities at the courts and castles of the great men with whom he stayed.⁵ Still it was not always that he could see important actors and obtain information from them or even from well-informed authorities on the many events he describes. As his ready credulity did not usually permit him to weigh carefully the historical value of the evidence offered, his narrative is reliable or unreliable according to the character of the informant.⁶ Nor does he often attempt to increase his knowledge by the study of documents; these he rarely incorporated in his chronicles, which therefore lack the precision of detail given by such studies.

It is especially important for our purposes to determine the character of Froissart's source of information on the revolt in 1381. According to M. Kervyn de Lettenhove this was no other than

¹ Cf. his reception by Gaston de Foix, and the latter's comments on his history—*ibid.*, XI. 3-4—by the seigneur de Coucy, together with the latter's invitation. XIV. 3-4.

² *Ibid.* II., 2. "Moult de paine et de travail en eue en plusieurs manieres, an-chois que je l'eusse compile ne accompli, tant que de le labour de ma teste e de l'essil de mon corps."

³ *Ibid.*, XIV. 3. This and the following passage are not contained in Berners's translation.

⁴ *Ibid.*, XI. 2.

⁵ For instance, at the court of Edward III., of Wenceslas, Duke of Brabant and Luxemburg, or of Gaston de Foix, Count of Béarn.

⁶ Cf. the absurd tales related to him by Espaing de Lyon, which he records in all earnestness. XI. 22 ff.

Robert de Namur, Lord of Beaufort and Chièvres in Hainault, a patron to whom Froissart dedicated an edition of the first book of his *Chronicles*.¹ He was at the court of Richard II. during the revolt, and therefore an eye-witness of some of the most important events. Let us examine the arguments for this hypothesis.

It consists of traces of Robert's influence on Book II., the first indication of which is found in the account of the actions of the sire de Bournazel, French ambassador to Scotland, in Flanders.² The latter does not appear in a favorable light, whence M. Kervyn assumes a hostility to the French on the part of Froissart, and consequently the influence of Robert de Namur, who was a devout English partizan. But this is assigning very little consequence to Froissart's impartiality, of which the editor elsewhere thinks so highly.³ To detect the hand of a particular individual in an instance which at best could be ascribed to one of his political party, of which the chronicler knew many representatives, is hardly warranted. The incident could be of no more than confirmative value for more positive evidence.

Further traces of the same influence are found in two references to Robert in Book II. Under the year 1380 it is briefly recorded that he came with his men-at-arms to aid the Count of Flanders at the siege of Ghent,⁴ and in 1382, after a long description of the progress of Anne of Bohemia, Richard II.'s intended wife, from her home to England, we are informed in a few words that Sir Robert escorted her from Utrecht to London, for which the English King and barons bore him great gratitude.⁵ But both of these notices are no more than commensurate with the importance of his part of the action described; they might have been recorded of any other individual rendering the same services. If we compare them with the notices of Robert in that edition of the first book, which he no doubt inspired, or with those of Guy de Blois in the second book, of which he was patron,⁶ we shall see that Froissart was more generous in his notices of the achievements of his patrons.

¹ *Ibid.*, II. 5. Cf. I. Pt. I., 99-100.

² It is related how while waiting for favorable winds at l'Écluse he put on almost royal state. For this and his neglect to pay respects to the Count of Flanders he is summoned into the latter's presence, and is very roughly spoken to by him and the Duke of Brittany. This he does not dare resent, being in their power. *Chroniques*, IX. 123 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, I. Pt. I., 487 ff.

⁴ "La vint messires Robert de Namur servir le conte a une quantite de gens d'armes, ensi que il estoit escrrips et mandes." IX. 349.

⁵ "Et toudis fu en sa compaignie, depuis que elle vint a Trec en Alemaigne, chils gentils et loyaux chevaliers, messires Robert de Namur, jusque a tant que elle fu espousee, de quoi li rois d'engleterre et li baron li seurent grant gret." IX. 462.

⁶ The editor has himself collected and compared the former passages. I. Pt. II., Ch. 5. For the latter see X. 181-182, 242, 245.

The most important proof of influence of Robert de Namur that M. Kervyn has introduced is, to my mind, the detailed and circumstantial character of Froissart's account of the revolt in 1381, which we know Robert witnessed. Still the fullness of an account does not of itself show the influence of a well-informed eye-witness. There should be other confirmatory circumstances, as, for example, accuracy. This, as in the following studies we shall have abundant cause to see, is almost entirely lacking. More than this, the account contains a number of errors which an eye-witness could not have made. Robert de Namur, who according to Froissart accompanied the King to Mile End, would not have related that the Queen-mother remained in the Tower and was insulted by the insurgents, when it is evident from contemporary documents that she too was with the King.¹ How could a man who must have seen Tyler and the other insurgent leaders at Mile End have said that they were at this time engaged in plundering the Tower and murdering the Archbishop?² Nor would one who was present at the audience of the rebel envoy with the King, have confused the insurgent with Sir John Newton, royal ambassador to the insurgents.³ Moreover, the two notices of Robert which Froissart gives in his account of the revolt are not such as we usually find him giving of an informant. He would probably have recognized his patron's devotion and services more than by merely enumerating him among those who were with the King in the Tower and those who accompanied the King to Mile End.⁴

It is also to be added that M. Kervyn's hypothesis is somewhat at variance with his researches on the time of composition of Book II. For while he assumes this to have been in 1387-1388, he believes that Froissart did not come under the influence of Robert de Namur until 1390-1392.⁵ He must certainly suppose, however, that the chronicler obtained his information on the second book between the years it covers, 1378-1385, and the time of its composition. Let us see whether this is likely.

To be quite exact, the date of the composition of Book II. may have been a trifle earlier than 1387. Its limits are fixed by two passages in Froissart's work. In the account of the birth of Catherine of France in 1378 he tells us that she afterwards became

¹ *Ibid.*, IX. 404, *vs.* Riley, *Memorials of London*, 449; *Eng. Hist. Review*, XIII. 517.

² *Chroniques*, IX. 403, *vs.* *Eng. Hist. Review*, Riley, as above.

³ See below, 18, n. 1.

⁴ *Chroniques*, IX. 395, 405. Cf. the notices cited in the fourth note preceding: *Chroniques*, XIII. 18.

⁵ *Ibid.* I. Pt. II., 104 ff., 141-142, 42-49, 124-125; I. 281.

Duchess of Berry; now she was married to Jean de Berry in 1386.¹ We also know that Book II. was completed before his journey to Béarn, where he arrived at Orthez on 25 November, 1388.² Book II. was therefore written after 1386, and before the autumn of 1388. But all the evidence in our possession goes to show that during this period Froissart lived with Guy, Count of Blois, whose chaplain and historian he was. His description of the progress of the latter from Blois to Bourges, in August, 1386, when on the road to his son's nuptials, seems that of an eye-witness. In July, 1388, he was also at Blois when the Duke of Berry asked for the hand of Lancaster's daughter;³ from here he started in 1388 on his Journey to Béarn.⁴ The tone of Book II. is that of the French party, to which Guy belonged, while Robert de Namur was an adherent of England. Finally, the character of the references to Guy in the second book establishes the fact that he was the patron.⁵

It is of course not impossible that Froissart saw Robert de Namur between 1381 and 1386. We know that he constantly tried to keep informed on passing events; indeed, he tells us that his information on the revolt was contemporaneously acquired.⁶ But in this case the burden of proof rests with those who would maintain that Robert gave him this information. The probability certainly is that he was under the same influence from 1381 to 1386 as in 1386-1388. For as early as 1373 he received the cure of Lestinnes, which was under the patronage of Guy de Blois,⁷ and afterwards gave it up only to accept the more profitable benefice of Chimay from the same patron, and to become his chaplain. No date is recorded for this promotion which brought him into more intimate relations with Guy; but we know that Froissart remained his chaplain until the Count's death, 12 December, 1397.⁸ And while it is impossible to establish with absolute certainty just when Froissart

¹ IX. 44. Cf. III. 82.

² *Chroniques*, XI. 3. This was St. Catherine's day. Cf. *ibid.*, 1-2, where he tells us that he had finished recounting the events in Flanders and Picardy before his journey south and before relating the wars in the south. Now these events in Picardy and Flanders are recounted at the close of the second book.

³ *Chroniques*, XIII. 81-82. Froissart also wrote a pastorelle describing this marriage.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 112. This event occurred in 1388, as Kervyn recognizes (I. Pt. I., 315); yet on another occasion, he concludes from the same passage that Froissart was on the banks of the Loire in 1387. I. Pt. II., 109.

⁵ This is admitted by Kervyn himself. I. Pt. II., 109.

⁶ "J'en parleray et le remonstreray selonc ceque dou fait de le incidensse j'en fuy adont informes." *Ibid.*, 387.

⁷ *Chroniques*, ed. Luce, I. liv., vi.

⁸ Kervyn, XVI. 70, 279.

was under the patronage of Robert de Namur, the indications are that this was before his relations with Guy de Blois.¹

Neither from the chronological probabilities of the case, therefore, nor from the character of Book II., is it likely that it was written under the influence of Robert de Namur. The character of the account of the revolt in 1381 certainly indicates that it could not possibly have been derived from this nobleman, who was an eye-witness of the event.

From what has been already said it is apparent that Book II. was not written contemporaneously with events,—a fact which holds good for most of Froissart's work, and this fact is of importance in estimating its historical value. This is further proved by two passages in his account of the revolt. One of these has already been cited;² in the other he speaks of the punishment of three rebel aldermen of London which did not occur till at least a year and a half after the rebellion.³ He seems to have kept record of the information he was constantly acquiring in notes or some similar record.⁴ By the time he came to write, his conceptions, though possibly improved by additional information and criticism, were much influenced by certain moral and rhetorical purposes which we shall now proceed to examine.

His moral purpose which, singular to say, has not been hitherto noticed, is thus announced at the beginning of the well-known first edition:

"To thentent that the honorable and noble adventures of featis of armes, done and achyued by ye warres of Frâce and Englande, shulde notably be inregistered, and put in perpetuall memory, whereby the prewe and hardy may have ensample to incourage them in theyr well doying, I, syr John Froissart, wyll treat and recorde an hystory of great louage and praise."⁵

¹ The researches of Siméon Luce, which have appeared since Kervyn's make a satisfactory showing to the effect that this was between 1369, when Queen Philippa, Robert's sister-in-law, died, and 1373, when Froissart became curé of Lestines. During this time the book dedicated to this patron was written *Chroniques*, ed. Luce, I. vii., ix., xx.—xxvii.

² Note the words "j'en fuy adont infourmes" in the citation just quoted.

³ *Chroniques*, IX. 402. "Li IX estoient pour ly et pour le roy, sicom il le monstrent, et ly troy de la sect de ce mescheant peuple, sicom il fu püssedi secul et cognu, dont il le comparent moult chierement." The three were not called to account till the Parliament of October, 1382; in November they were convicted and excepted from the general pardon. *Rot. Parl.*, III. 139; Rymer, *Foedera*, IV. 156; Réville, *Soulèvement*, 190 ff., 198.

⁴ Speaking of information acquired on his journey to Béarn he remarks: "Je les mettoie par escript . . . pour en avoir plus fresche memoire ou temps avenir." *Chroniques*, XI. 74. The marshall of Aquitaine thus bade him record the birth of the Prince of Wales: "Froissart, escriptes et mettes es memoire," etc. *Ibid.*, XVI. 234.

⁵ Berners, I. 1; Kervyn, I. 4. The above translation is not literal, but gives the full sense of the original.

He writes "pour tous noble cuers encouragier et eux monstrier exemple et matiere d'onneur," his greatest hope for the future being that from his work all noble and valiant men might take pleasure and encouragement in well doing.¹ His design, therefore, was not to write history as we understand it but to furnish brave knights with a good example. The effect of this tendency is not usually promotive of historic truth. It often causes Froissart to idealize the action and characters of his knights, nobles and kings in a manner not consistent with the actual state of affairs.²

He has announced his moral purpose in describing the revolt in the opening remarks on the subject: "Che fu une merveilleuse cose et de poure fondation, dont ceste pestillensse commiencha en Engleterre; et pour donner exemple a toutes manieres de bonnes gens, j'en parleray."³ His purpose was here to furnish a warning example to all good people, to show the sin and folly of such rebellion, and to reveal in the heroism of the civic and rural nobility, and especially of the young King, a shining example for imitation. With such an end in view he could hardly be fair to the rebels.

Froissart's rhetorical purpose must likewise be remembered in passing on the credibility of his work. It must be remembered that he was a poet, who occupies quite a place in French literature.⁴ Indeed, his *Chronicles* are of a poetic character and may be fitly termed a poem in prose, for they are garnished with touches which only a poet could invent. They are like an old French romance, save that they are in prose instead of verse, and record actual rather than mythical events; the moral purpose of exhorting to knightly virtues is in each case the same. To this poetic tendency Froissart owes much of the beauty of his style, its charm and grace, its freshness and naivety. But on the other hand his historical trustworthiness is naturally impaired in consequence. Facts are distorted to produce a fine narrative, while touches purely poetic are added without the requisite foundation of truth. Incidents that he thinks probably occurred are often invented.

Froissart's well-known love and admiration for the chivalry of the 14th century, however valuable they make him as a historian of the culture of the upper classes and his work as a manual of chivalry, have disastrously affected his account of the revolt. The

¹ Kervyn, II. 5; XI. 2.

² Cf. his idealization of the actions of Sir Robert de Salle. See below; of Richard II. in the fourth and fifth papers of this series.

³ *Ibid.*, IX. 386-387.

⁴ For Froissart's literary value of Kervyn, I. Pt. I., Ch. 30; Luce, I. Introd. Ch. 3; Aubertin, *Hist. de la Littérature Française au Moyen Âge*, II. Ch. 3; Petit de Julleville, *Hist. de la Langue et de la Lit. Franç.*, II. 316-322.

burgher's son of Valenciennes indeed has appreciation for the struggles of the communes of Flanders; but in general the upper classes alone awake his sympathy. His reputed impartiality is only for those engaged in what he considers legitimate warfare, and never extends to rebellious peasants like the Jacques Bonhommes in France and the English commons of 1381; he has no sympathy for their aspirations. His introductory remarks on the revolt just quoted are characteristic; it is for him a "*pestillensse*," of strange cause and poor foundation; the people are fools, who rebel because they are too prosperous and do not know what they want, under leaders who are rogues and scalawags.¹ Listen to his estimate of the relative worth of the classes in England: "Li gentilhomme sont de noble et loial condition et li commons peuples est de fele, perilleas, orgueilleuse et desloiale condition."²

The effect of Froissart's idealization of knighthood, of his moral purpose in describing the revolt, and of his rhetorical propensities may best be studied in some characteristic part of his narrative. A good instance will be found in the charming story of the death of Sir Robert de Salle at the hands of the rebels before Norwich. On Corpus Christi day Sir Robert is summoned to a parley by a great rout of commons from Lynn, Bedford, Cambridge and Yarmouth marching on London under command of a rascal named "Listier." He comes, but in a pretty dialogue refuses the offer to become their leader and ruler of a fourth part of England. They therefore attack him, and he, after prodigious feats of valor, one against thousands, is hacked to pieces.³

Although this story bristles with errors,⁴ it merits consideration from having been accepted, among others, by no less an authority than Mr. Powell.⁵ Contemporary jury indictments, however, and the municipal rolls of Norwich give a different picture of these

¹ *Chroniques*, ed. Kervyn, IX. 386, 405, 406.

² *Ibid.*, II. 17. While this comment was written under the impression made by the deposition of Richard II., it also expresses his opinion of the rebels in 1381.

³ *Chroniques*, ed. Kervyn, IX. 407-409. Cf. the quaint translation of the speeches by Berners, I. 648.

⁴ It is well known that the commons of Bedford and Cambridge did not participate in the Norfolk revolt, but were engaged in separate revolts at home. Neither they nor the insurgents of Norfolk advanced *en masse* on London, and had they done so, Norwich lay far to the east of their route. Listere was captain of Norfolk only and remained there throughout the revolt. Cf. the chapters on the revolt in those counties; Powell and Réville, as above. The rebels did not desire to make him their captain and ruler of a fourth part of England, and they had no design of deposing Richard II., but sent envoys to purchase privileges of him. *Rotuli Congregationum Norwicensium*, 4 Richard II. (Bloomfield, *Hist. of Norfolk*, III. 108); Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, II. 6.

⁵ Powell, *East Anglia Rising*, 29, 31; Rogers's *Hist. of Agriculture*, I. 86-87. Cf. the more conservative criticism of Réville, *Soulèvement*, 103-104.

events. On June 17, not Corpus Christi, the insurgents of Norfolk assembled in camp at Mousehold heath, and were admitted into the city by consent of the council, which in order to placate them went so far as to give them a large sum of money.¹ They proceeded straightway to plunder the houses of Sir Robert de Salle and other of their chief opponents, and on the same day beheaded Sir Robert in their camp at Mousehold. His death was not a tumultuous combat, but conducted in an orderly manner, under legal forms,² probably under pretext of the King's permission granted at Mile End—"that they might take those who were traitors to him and slay them, wheresoever they might be found."³

Only the basic facts of the incident as recorded by Froissart are true, *viz.*, that the insurgents under command of Listere, which is the real form of the leader's name, assembled before Norwich and there slew Sir Robert de Salle. The details are wrong and may probably be accounted for by the fact that Froissart heard that this nobleman, whom he knew as a valiant knight in the French wars, had been ignobly slain by the insurgents before Norwich. It therefore behooved him, drawing partly on his knowledge, but more on his imagination, to provide his hero with a fitting apotheosis. Nor is this an unfair instance of his method, but one which has been chosen because other sources afford the means of safely controlling it.

Instances of this kind are by no means rare;⁴ we shall see two pertinent examples in his idealization of the young King's conduct at Mile End and Smithfield. The basic facts are often comparatively reliable, and may then be attributed to the notes which Froissart took from his informant, contemporary with the events he narrates. The details, however, are so influenced by his moral and rhetorical purposes, by his prejudice against the insurgents and idealization of chivalry that they are not to be depended upon, unless supported by more reliable testimony.⁵

¹ Powell, 27-28; Bloomfield, as above, III. 108, citing *Atlas*, 308.

² Cf. the indictments of Henry Roys, of Dilham and Adam Pulter. Powell, 132. They claimed a royal warrant for his execution.

³ Riley, *Memorials of London*, 449. Sir Robert had publicly condemned their actions. Walsingham, *Hist. Engl.*, II. 5-6.

⁴ A similar example is found in the account of the trials of Sire Jean Neuton, supposed captain of Rochester, whom the rebels pressed into service as envoy to the King (IX. 393, 395-396). Froissart probably confused him with Sir John Newton, the royal messenger to Tyler. Walsingham, *Hist. Engl.*, I. 463-464.

⁵ Other characteristics of Froissart's work must here be omitted as not having important bearing on the rising in 1381. His geographical knowledge does not prevent him from making errors of place in his account of the revolt. As a man of some military observation his description of armies and battles, and also his estimates of the numbers of forces are usually good. His chronology is often bad, but this is not so evident in our subject, in which no extensive chronological problems are involved.

II. AN ANONYMOUS FRENCH CHRONICLE OF THE REVOLT.

All students of the revolt owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Trevelyan for his publication in 1898 of a fragment of a chronicle originally found at St. Mary's, York, under the title of *An Account of the Rising in 1381*.¹ It is taken from the Stowe MS. 1047, in the British museum, and is in the handwriting of Stowe's friend Francis Thynne. Before this publication I had noted the wealth of information on the revolt in Stowe's *Chronicle* not traceable to his other sources of information, and had reconstructed the original in English from his narrative, ascribing it to some lost account, probably of London origin. The appearance of the original, with its greater wealth of detail, more than confirmed my opinion of its value, convincing me that this last is the most valuable of surviving contemporary accounts.

As will be seen from the title given by Thynne, *Oute of an anonimalle cronicle belonging to the abbey of St. Marics in Yorke*,² we have to do with the fragment of a longer work. The part preserved is concerned only with the rising in 1381. Neither Thynne nor Stowe gives us any clue to the character of the rest of the work or to its authorship, beyond the former's statement of its anonymity; in his *Chronicle* the latter cites the *Chronicle of St. Mary's, York*.³ Although written in French it is evidently the work of an Englishman, for there is a very large admixture of English words, and the idiom of the language is English. From the title given by Stowe we might infer a Northern origin, but the English words of the text do not, as far as I can see, disclose the dialect of the author. There is only one English passage of any length; *viz.* the watchword of the commons, "With whome haldes you," and the response, "With Kinge Richarde and the true comons."⁴ The form "haldes" is indeed Northern; but in this case we should expect "wham" instead of whome.

If the work had been written at St. Mary's, York, we should expect to hear something of the grave disturbances in Yorkshire of which we are reliably informed, and of the revolt in the north.⁵ But nothing of the kind appears. The events of Kent, Essex and London are the only ones narrated in detail. What occurred in London and the vicinity is as minutely and vividly described as one

¹ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII. 509-522.

² *Ibid.*, 509. "Anonimalle" evidently means anonymous; in Thynne's *Animadversions*, (E. E. T. S., 1875), Introd., 89; we hear of "other anonymalle Chronicles."

³ Stowe, *Annales* (ed. 1631), 285.

⁴ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII. 513.

⁵ *Rot. Parl.*, III. 393; Rymer, *Foedera*, IV. 127, 135.

would expect from an eye-witness of the events. This is particularly true of the events about the King's person; for example, the negotiations for his proposed interview with the insurgents at Blackheath, the vivid description of the siege of the Tower, which is given from the point of view of an inmate of the fortress, the account of the events at Mile End and Smithfield.¹ The source of this information seems to have been some one who was in the following of the King—perhaps a courtier, cleric or lay. For French, in which (instead of the usual Latin) our chronicle was written, was used longer at court than in the country at large. True, the London events, being the most important, merit chief attention, but this will not explain the chronicler's silence in regard to the north, if he really wrote there. Consider how Leicester, where Knighton lived, figures in his account, and St. Alban's in Walsingham's.² True, it is not impossible that Thynne in copying for his friend Stowe omitted northern events, but this is rendered unlikely by the fact that he did copy the account of the revolt in Norfolk, Suffolk, Huntingdon and at Ramsey.³ The title *Chronicle of St. Mary's, York*, is therefore a misnomer, so far as the origin of the work is concerned, and I prefer to refer to the surviving fragment as the *Anonymous French Chronicle of the Revolt*.

Its date is indicated by a passage in which the author refers to the death of John Wrawe, leader of the Suffolk insurgents, an event that did not occur until the parliament which met in June, 1382.⁴ I do not think that he wrote long after this date, for in vividness and detail as well as reliability, he bears every mark of being a contemporary. His vividness is not like that of the rhetorician Froissart, but crude and native, resulting from a knowledge of facts. Compared with other chroniclers his account, though full of new matter, is usually confirmed by their less detailed versions. He seems to have made careful use of such documents as he could get, giving one in full and the substance of two others, probably derived from having heard them pronounced.⁵ One of these we are able to compare with an original; that is, in the case of the demands of the insurgents at Mile End, and we find it substantially correct.⁶

¹ Pp. 513-514, 516, 517, 518-519.

² In the *Historia Anglicana* more than half of the narrative, 36 of 71 pages, is devoted to the St. Alban's disturbances. Knighton, II. 142-143.

³ Pp. 521-522.

⁴ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII. 521: "Sire Johne lauandit, le Chieftaine, fust apres prist come traitour et amene a Londres, et foreigne a la morte; et fust trayne, bowelle, pendu et decolle." For date of his execution see Réville, 156; Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, II. 63.

⁵ *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XIII., pp. 516, 517, 519.

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 517 with Rymer, *Foedera*, 126.

The foregoing statements apply particularly to the author's account of the meeting at Mile End. The narrative is vivid, the actions and speeches of the King and the insurgents are recorded in detail, yet without theatrical effect. In reciting the articles granted he does not use the order found in the royal order of revocation, as one having this before him would have done;¹ and yet he gives them correctly. He adds to the list given on the *Revocation* other articles, the authenticity of which is proved in one important instance by the city record of the rebellion.² These deviations from the official account indicate clearly that the writer was not a copyist who had access to the documents, but, in all probability a man who had actually heard the articles pronounced at Mile End.

III. THE MONK OF EVESHAM'S CHRONICLE.

The task of investigating the historical value of this work is the more difficult because of the antiquated character of the only published edition—that of Hearne in 1729—and the absence of recent research on the subject. As edited by Hearne it is taken from a manuscript of the Cotton library (Tiberius C. ix. 1), collated with another (Claudius B. ix.), of the same library.³ The text does not begin with the birth of Richard II., as we should expect of a biography, but with his accession in 1377, and ends not with his death in 1400, but with 1402. It treats the affairs of the kingdom in general, and not the actions of the King in particular. Richard is by no means the hero of the work, and wherever he is commented upon—only three times,—the comment is unfavorable.⁴ In fine, this is in no sense a biography, but a chronicle, and the generally accepted title *Vita Ricardi II* is a misnomer.

Luckily, there is still further evidence as to its character. The Harleian manuscript 2261 of the British museum is an English translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*, certainly made in the 15th century, and according to a surmise of the editor, between 1432 and 1450.⁵ Up to 1341 it follows the text of Higden, but in the middle

¹ As did, for example, the monk of Evesham, p. 32.

² Riley, *Memorials of London*, 445.

³ Mon. Evesham., XXIX. The account of the deposition of Richard II. contained in the Tiberius MS. and appended to the text is not an integral part of the *Vita*, but bearing a brief introduction, is taken entirely from the Parliament roll of that year. *Ibid.*, 182-216; *Rot. Parl.*, II. 417-424. No conclusions as to the date and authorship of the *Vita* can be drawn from the account of Richard's deposition. This account is shown to be of late origin by a reference to the interment of Richard II. at Westminster, which took place under Henry V. (p. 183); the postscript in this MS., immediately following it, contains an error impossible to a contemporary, when it confounds Henry IV. with Edward IV. (p. 216).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 147, 156, 169-170.

⁵ *Ranulph Higden Polychronicon* (R. S. '65), I. lxix; VIII. 428-518.

of that year it suddenly changes, following a new source.¹ The part of this continuation dealing with the years covered by the monk of Evesham,—1377–1402—is a literal translation of his work.² The other part of the *Continuation*, viz. 1341–1377, evidently forms an integral whole with the remainder, for the style and language are the same, and both parts bear the same relation to contemporary chroniclers. The Evesham chronicle, therefore, is a fragment of a Latin original used by the author of the Harleian MS. as a basis of his translation of a continuation of the *Polychronicon*. This Latin original was probably itself a continuation of that work, in which form we are told the so called *Vita Ricardi* most frequently appears.³

The relation of the monk of Evesham's work to the *Chronicon Angliae* and to Walsingham's *Historia Anglica* has often been noticed, but never exactly determined.⁴ While this cannot be conclusively settled without comparison of all the manuscripts, we can nevertheless gain from the published sources a sufficiently clear idea to enable us to grapple with the problem of the authorship of the supposed *Vita Ricardi*.

With the exception of a few unimportant notices, the first three years of the *Vita* are taken from a source common to the *Historia* and the *Chronicon* in which the narrative was much fuller. This is less the case for 1380, while for 1381 the *Vita* is almost entirely independent.⁵ From 1382 there is an increasing use of the common source of the other two, especially from 1384 to 1387, where the verbal coincidence with the *Chronicon Angliae* is very marked.⁶ With 1387 the latter virtually closes, and in 1388–1389 the agreement of the *Vita* with the *Historia* is well-nigh verbal. This is also true for 1390, save that some additional matter is given.⁷ With 1391 all traces of agreement disappear, and where the same incidents are narrated they are seemingly from a different source.⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, VIII. 339, n. 10.

² The editor fails to notice this, and laboriously collates the text with Walsingham's *Historia Anglica* and the *Chronicon Angliae*.

³ *Chron. Angliae*, XXXIII. n. 1.

⁴ Pauli, *Geschichte von England* (Gotha, 1855), IV. 729, who thinks its original was the *Hist. Angl.*; cf. the marginal references, *Polychronicon*, VIII. 729 ff.; *Chron. Angl.*, xxvi. xxxiii.

⁵ Mon. Evesham., 22–35; *Chr. Angl.*, 285 ff.; *Hist. Angl.*, I. 450 ff.

⁶ Mon. Evesham., 36–37, 41, 48; *Chr. Angl.*, 355, 357; for 1384–1387, Mon. Evesham., 56, 58–59, 63–65, 70–72, 72–79, 84–91, 97–98; *Chr. Angl.*, 361–362, 362–364, 365–367, 368–370, 370–376, 378–384, 386–387.

⁷ Mon. Evesham., 98–120; *Hist. Angl.*, II. 179–195; for additional matter in 1390, *ibid.*, 122–123.

⁸ E. g., the account of the Queen's death and of the King's journey to Ireland; as above, 125–126; II. 215–216.

From 1377 till 1390, therefore, the *Vita* agrees in the main with these sources, often with both, and in case of difference with one or the other. The tendency is to verbal agreement with the *Chronicon*, the *Historia* being generally more elaborate. As we already know that the former is copied mainly from a St. Alban's chronicle, which in an expurgated form is the basis of the latter,¹ it follows that the monk of Evesham used this same original, and that where not abbreviated he represents it more nearly than does Walsingham, who rewrote and improved.² Sometimes, indeed, when combining the narratives of both, he represents it more accurately than either.³ The *Chronicon Angliae* itself tells us, when referring us for further information in regard to the degradation of the cardinals by Pope Urban in 1385, that this original was brother Thomas Walsingham's *Chronica Majora Sancti Albani*.⁴

But although the *Chronica Majora* form the basis of the *Vita* to 1390, the monk of Evesham by no means confines himself to this source. He frequently adds notices of his own, particularly in connection with the monastery at Evesham or the Parliament,—two subjects in which he was particularly interested. His account of the sessions of Parliament is more extensive in proportion to the scope of his work than Walsingham's, and he frequently adds information not given by him.⁵ He evidently placed a high value on documents, not only incorporating those in the *Chronica Majora*, but adding from other sources. In one instance when enumerating the heresies and errors of Wycliffe he follows an official document instead of his usual authority, Walsingham.⁶

With the year 1391 the character of our chronicle suddenly changes. Up to this time the narrative was detailed, now it suddenly becomes very brief. The account for that year comprises hardly half a dozen lines,—a mere statement of the holding the Parliament, and of the result of the visit of a papal nuncio.⁷ The account of the following year does not occupy even a page of Hearne's text, and 1393, 1395 and 1396 require but little more, 1398 being

¹ *Chron. Angl.*, XXI. ff.

² Mon. Evesham., 71 ff.; *Chron. Angl.*, 369 ff.; *Hist. Angl.*, I. 144 ff.

³ As above, 70-71, 369, II. 143; or 74, 371, II. 146.

⁴ *Chron. Angl.*, 364. The specified information, unquestionably taken from this source, is found in *Hist. Angl.*, II. 122-123.

⁵ In 1385, for example, we receive additional information in regard to the Marquis of Dublin, and the treasure granted the new dukes; in 1390 about those incapable of receiving pardon and the taxation granted. The account of the Parliament of 1381 is based on a different source. Cf. Mon. Evesham., 66-67, 121-122, 34-35, with *Hist. Angl.*, II. 140-141, 195-196, 44-46.

⁶ Mon. Evesham., 37-40, identical with *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (R.S. 1858), 275-282; cf. *Hist. Angl.*, II. 58-59.

⁷ P. 123 ff., for this and the years immediately following.

somewhat more detailed, though not so much so as the years preceding 1391. The events of 1397, however, are treated at great length, especially the proceedings of Parliament, which are taken from the Roll or some other journal.¹ The same is true of 1399, and until the end the narrative maintains this detailed character. The change in the character of the work with 1391 leads us to inquire whether a new author began with that year. It has been generally supposed that there was but one author, an unknown monk of Evesham. But M. Petit-Dutaillis has lately advanced the opinion that while a monk of Evesham may have written the latter part, the first is by another hand.² It is to be regretted that he does not support his opinion by the reasons which he doubtless had in mind.

The observations just made in regard to the changed character of the *Vita* with 1391, both as to the sudden transition from a detailed account to a mere narrative, and as to the cessation of the use of Walsingham from that date, at first sight speaks for this view. Furthermore the character and frequency of the references to Evesham certainly show that the author of the latter portion was a monk of this place. Without mentioning the name of the monastery he speaks of Evesham in 1401 as "*hoc monasterium*," and in 1395 he speaks of the presence of the King at the installation of the same bishop at Llandoff and then at Worcester as seeming "*mirabile in oculis nostris*."³ In 1393 we hear of the death of Prior Nicolas of Evesham after a rule of forty years and one month; in 1399 of Henry IV.'s passage through the town, and in 1400 of a pestilence which raged with especial violence in the vale of Evesham. We are told that the King remained in the monastery two days in 1400 and three in 1401; during the latter year he visited there three times in one year,—an honor unheard of in the annals of the house.⁴

But unfortunately for M. Petit-Dutaillis's hypothesis we find an equally explicit reference to Evesham in the first part of the work. In 1384 the author gives a minute account, far longer than any of those mentioned above, of a difference between the Prior of Evesham and the Archbishop of Canterbury on occasion of the latter's visitation of the monastery. The incident is given in such detail (occupying two pages of the printed text) as could only be expected

¹ *Ibid.*, 131, 157; *Rot. Parl.*, II. 348, 416, for 1397 and 1399.

² Réville, *Soulèvement en 1381*, ix.

³ P. 127; p. 176: "Et hoc jam tertio manifestus est rex iste Henricus infra annum in hoc monasterio, quod non putatur aliquem regem fecisse a tempore fundationis usque in praesens."

⁴ Pp. 124, 152, 170, 173, 174; 176. Cf. the preceding note.

from a monk of the abbey.¹ Besides this, there occur certain characteristics both before and after 1391 which point to a single author for the entire work. We noticed above the importance ascribed to Parliaments in the first part of the work. This is much more the case in the latter part, where the greater portions of the narratives for 1397 and 1399 are taken directly from the Parliament Rolls. The chronicler's fondness for documents continues throughout the work, even if we except the documents derived from Walsingham.²

The same author, therefore, a monk of Evesham, wrote the entire work. His independent part began with 1391, and the brief and incomplete character of the account during the years following can be best explained by the supposition that he wrote from memory. Even his long account of 1397 is certainly not contemporary, but derived from a Parliament Roll; for in speaking of the murder of the Duke of Gloucester he promises to tell of it in its proper place, which is not done till 1399.³ The account of this latter year is detailed and valuable, and, making allowances for what in 1399 is copied from the Parliament Roll, the same detailed character prevails throughout the remaining narrative. Beginning with the reign of Henry IV. the author writes as one would expect from a contemporary residing at Evesham. The struggle with the neighboring Welsh occupies his chief attention,⁴ and the repeated times that Henry IV. stopped at the monastery on his way to and from these wars may explain the origin of the chronicle.⁵ Why should it not have been written in some relation to these royal visits? It is certainly as favorable to the King as it is opposed to his predecessor, with whose deposition it is in hearty sympathy. Contrast the reflections on Richard's cupidity and extravagance, and the unfavorable estimate of his character, with the commendation of Henry IV., "*pius et misericors et generosus*."⁶ If the narrative did not break off suddenly in the middle of the reign of Henry IV., we should probably hear even greater eulogies of this prince.

The account of the revolt in 1381 given by the monk of Evesham is consequently in no wise contemporary. He indeed had access to the *Chronica Majora*, for both accounts contain some remarks on the designs of the rebels and the reputed confession of

¹ Pp. 53-55.

² Pp. 28, 38-40, 134-135, 143 (articles of treason), 157-159, 160.

³ P. 130. "Ut infra loco suo plenius diceretur." In 1399 he relates the incident, stating that he had spoken of it above, "*supra enim narratur*." P. 161.

⁴ Pp. 171-179, 182.

⁵ Pp. 173, 174, 176.

⁶ Pp. 147, 156, 169-170, 165. He has also omitted the passages detrimental to John of Gaunt, contained in the *Chronica Majora* and preserved in the *Chron. Angliae*, 195-196, 199-200, 205, 210-211.

Jack Straw;¹ but with this exception their narratives differ entirely. The Evesham narrative is independent of all the other chronicles. The question therefore arises whether this independent part is due to the author himself, and consequently the mere personal opinion of a monk in a western priory, or whether it was derived from an older source. The latter seems probable from the nature of the account, which, save for brief references to Norfolk, Suffolk and Huntingdon,² confines itself exclusively to the events in and about London. In striking contrast to other contemporary chronicles, which give minute local descriptions,³ there is not a word about the revolt in the west country, where Evesham lay, although we have reason to believe that disturbances occurred there.⁴ The original then seems to have been a London source, and as such is more reliable for London events than the work of a monk in a distant western monastery. The time which we have assigned for the origin of the whole work—the beginning of the reign of Henry IV.—makes it likely that this original source, like the others used, was contemporary.

In our examination of his relation to the *Chronica Majora* we have already seen how the monk of Evesham uses his sources, either abbreviating or else copying verbatim, sometimes indeed omitting parts of the original, but never distorting it. There are interesting and characteristic examples in the account of the revolt. The remarks on the designs of the insurgents terminating in the reputed confession of Jack Straw, agree almost verbally with those of the *Chronica Angliæ* and the *Historia Anglicana*, and are certainly taken from a common original.⁵ The enumeration in this chronicle of the demands of the insurgents at Mile End agrees entirely in substance and almost verbally with the record in the revocation of pardons.⁶ We may therefore assume that this account of the revolt, and certainly the part relating to Mile End, is worthy of belief.

Of the remaining chronicles which notice the meeting at Mile End, Malverne's continuation of Higden and the continuer of Knighton, add almost nothing to our knowledge. Adam of Usk,⁷ however, a contemporary lawyer who wrote after the accession of Henry IV., throws a little light on the articles conceded the in-

¹ Pp. 31-32.

² P. 30.

³ Above, 21, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. map, Trevelyan, *Age of Wycliffe*, 254.

⁵ Mon. Evesham, 31-32; *Chron. Angl.*, 308-310; *Hist. Angl.*, II. 8-10.

⁶ Mon. Evesham, 517; Rymer, *Foedera* (ed. 1869), IV. 126.

⁷ Malverne, John, *Chronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby in *Polychronicon, Ranulphi Higden*, Vol. IX., R. S., 1886; *Chronicon Henrici Knighton vel Critthon, monachi Leycesterensis*, ed. J. R. Lumby, R. S., 1889-1895.

surgents.¹ Four of these articles are recorded in the royal order by which they were afterwards revoked, while the official² city record of the insurrection, a document issued just after the revolt to justify the action of the mayor and his adherents, gives another article not contained in the revocation.³

IV. THE KING AND THE PEOPLE AT MILE END.

Let us now proceed to examine the actual occurrences at Mile End, beginning with a brief consideration of the events that led up to the meeting of the King with the insurgents, in order that we may see how it came to take place and what its object was.

On Corpus Christi day, Thursday, June 13, the insurgents by aid of their civic allies entered London. The chief division of their Southern army, which had encamped at Blackheath, straightway invested the Tower, where the King, his council and a large number of the nobility and gentry had taken refuge. Although this fortress was defended by an adequate garrison which, aided by the refugees, might have offered stout resistance, the inmates could not be depended upon, owing to the panic among them.⁴ Besides, the rebels were constantly reinforced by fresh hordes hurrying on London, and had on that afternoon intercepted the stock of provisions intended for the Tower.⁵

Who directed the course of government during this crisis? The royal council, frequently mentioned in the sources, was much reinforced by members of the nobility who had taken refuge in the Tower, but its vote was advisory in character. The governing power had heretofore been the ministers and the more intimate circle of advisers composing the privy council. During the minority of Richard II. this body had become practically a council of regency.⁶ Among its most influential members were John of Gaunt, then absent on an embassy to Scotland, Simon of Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellor, and Sir Robert Hales, the treasurer. These the rebels held chiefly responsible for existing misgovernment. Although the chancellor and treasurer had up to

¹ *Chronicon Adae de Uik*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson. Royal Society of Literature, 1876.

² Rymer, *Foedera* (rev. Caley and Holbrooke. Record Commission, 1869), IV. 126.

³ Riley, H. T., *Memorials of London* (London, 1868), pp. 449-451.

⁴ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 516, *bis*; Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 458; Mon. Evesham, 26. According to Walsingham the garrison consisted of 600 men-at-arms and a like number of archers.

⁵ Walsingham, as above.

⁶ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (5th ed.), III. 254.

this directed the royal policy¹ in regard to the insurgents, the former had on the preceding day resigned his office,² while retaining his place as adviser to the King. But as they, along with most of the remaining ministry, and the chief justices, were prescribed by the insurgents,³ they could not continue to direct the affairs of state, if the demands of the latter were to be met.

In reading the account of the *Anonymous French Chronicle* we are struck by the prominent part taken by the young King in the councils held in the Tower.⁴ While this is partly to be attributed to medieval parlance,⁵ and, perhaps, to the desire of the councillors by thrusting the King prominently forward to shield themselves, it may also indicate unaccustomed activity on his part, probably with the desire to save his friends. Still, it is hardly likely that the lad of fifteen years suddenly took the government into his own hands, only to relinquish it as soon as the revolt was over.⁶ His conduct was more probably directed by the experienced members of the royal council which surrounded him. Possibly his mother, the Princess of Wales, had much influence upon him.⁷

The important question now before the council was, whether they should yield to the demand of the insurgents that the King in person come and hear their grievances. This is what the insurgents had demanded on the previous day; and the council had agreed to an interview on the morning of Corpus Christi, but terrified at the threatening attitude of the insurgents had hurried the King back to London. Such an interview of course meant acquiescence in their requirements for the execution of the councillors and radical economic reform, for it would have placed the King completely in their power. The council was therefore divided in opinion. According to the generally accepted account of Froissart, one party, led by William Walworth, mayor of London, advocated a night attack on the insurgents by the combined forces of the Tower and the

¹ *Eulogium Historiarum* (Rolls Series), III. 352; Malverne, 2-3; Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 456.

² Rymer, *Foedera*, IV. 122.

³ On the same morning the insurgents demanded the heads of fifteen lords and gentlemen, fourteen of whom were present in the Tower. Among these were John of Gaunt, the chancellor, the treasurer, the clerk of the privy seal, two of the chief justices (*An. Fr. Chr.*, 513). Sir John Cavendish, the other chief justice, was killed by the rebels of Suffolk.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 516.

⁵ All acts of government are supposedly performed by the King. If the council meets, he calls a council; its decisions are the King's.

⁶ Before, as after the revolt till his 23rd year, he was content to remain in tutelage.

⁷ He was placed under her care at his accession in 1377; Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (4th ed.), II. 462. We know that she was with him during the whole crisis and accompanied him to Mile End.

King's adherents in the city, while another, under William Montacute, Earl of Salisbury, was for conciliation. But we have already seen that the details of Froissart's narrative cannot be safely accepted without confirmation of more reliable sources, and this is not forthcoming.¹

Coupled with their summons the insurgents now made threats of an ominous nature. According to a reliable authority their message was that if the King did not speedily come into their presence they would immediately destroy the Tower, nor should he escape alive.² In the determinative session of the council that followed, the members are represented as having been at a loss what to do—quite naturally so, in deciding the matter of losing their own heads—the young King himself making the decision, which was to grant the demands of the interview; for he cherished the forlorn hope that all the besiegers of the Tower would leave, and give their intended victims a chance to escape.³ The mayor of London was therefore instructed to have the sheriffs and aldermen proclaim in the wards that all persons between the ages of fifteen and sixty should on the morrow at noon assemble to meet the King at Mile End. This decision was probably reached in the evening of Corpus Christi.⁴

It seems likely that even before this decision⁵ an attempt had been made by an interview with the King and by promises from the

¹ Froissart, IX. 401-402. According to John Malverne (pp. 2-3), Sudbury and Hales, not Walworthe, still headed the party that was opposed to conciliation. If Salisbury headed the other party and played such an important part as Froissart here and elsewhere assigns him (IX. 398-399), it is surprising that his name is mentioned only a single time in the detailed accounts of the chroniclers and in the numerous documents on the revolt, viz., in the anonymous French account, where we are told that he was in London on 12th June (*ibid.*, 513); Froissart's knowledge of Walworthe's important part in subduing the rebellion, and of Salisbury's reputation as a soldier in France and as English commissioner for the treaty of Bretigny, may have caused his error.

² Mon. Evesham., 27. "Quod sine mora ad eos inermis; quod nisi celeriter adimpleret, turrim ipsam statim diruerent, nec ipse vivus evaderet." This threat is confirmed by Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 458; Malverne, 3. Although the monk of Evesham tells us that it was made on the following day from Mile End, he also relates that the interview was conceded in consequence. As we know from other sources that the decision to yield was not reached on the 14th, but on the 13th (*An. Fr. Chr.*, 516; Froissart, IX. 402), it seems likely that he refers to the ultimatum of the rebels on the latter day.

³ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 516.

⁴ Froissart, IX. 401, assumes that it was in the evening. Allowing time for the King's journey to and from Greenwich, the insurgents' march from Blackheath to London, and the preceding negotiations, his assumption seems likely, although we hear from the *An. Fr. Chr.*, 514, that the King had returned to the Tower by 9 a. m.

⁵ The *Anonymous Chronicle* records it after the council meeting, but without stating that it followed in point of time. It appears to me a last attempt to conciliate and avoid making a complete surrender.

Tower, to induce the insurgents to disperse. Mounting a turret on the east side, nearest St. Catherine's, where the chief body lay, the young King had exhorted them to retire peacefully to their homes, promising to pardon all their trespasses. The answer came back, amidst great clamor, that they would never leave until they had secured the traitors in the Tower, until he had conceded them freedom from all manner of serfdom and other points which they would demand. Richard made a great show of granting these requests. In their sight he caused a charter to be drawn up and sealed it himself; two knights bore it down to the insurgents, and one of them mounting an old chair, read aloud to the following intent: "The King thanks his good commons for their loyalty, and pardons all their illegal offenses; but he wishes everyone to return home and set down his grievances in writing, and send it to him. By the advice of his lords and council he will then provide such remedy as will be profitable to himself, his commons and the whole realm."¹ But the people shouted that this was nothing but trifles and a mockery. Some even rushed through the streets demanding that every lawyer or person able to make such writs or write letters be beheaded.

The night that followed must have been a terrible one for the inmates of the Tower. They saw the flaming houses of those whom the insurgents hated, their own perhaps among them, in and about the city; their ears were dinned with the clamor of the besiegers, crying as if "tout li diable d'enfer fuissent entre yaulx."² Gloomy indeed must have been their forebodings for the morrow.

Mile End, the appointed meeting place of the King with his rebellious subjects, was then a village in the midst of a fine meadow, where the Londoners were wont to recreate on holidays.³ Because this had been the assembly place of the men of Essex who took part in the revolt, it has been generally assumed that it was chiefly these with whom the King treated on June 14.⁴ As a matter of fact it was the entire insurgent army.⁵ This was the largest number

¹ The original document of which the above is a condensation, is preserved in the *Anonymous Chronicle*, 516.

² Froissart, as above. Cf. the vivid description of *An. Fr. Chr.*, 515-516.

³ Froissart, IX. 404. His long residence in London lends weight to this statement.

⁴ Although Walsingham alone among the sources makes this statement (*Hist. Angl.*, I. 462-463), it is accepted by Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (4th ed.), II. 400; Green, *Hist. Eng. People*, I. 473; Réville, 30, 41.

⁵ The language of the official city record is conclusive on this point: "All the men of Kent and Essex, . . . together with some of the perfidious persons of the city aforesaid." Riley, *Memorials of London*, 449. Such was also the understanding of the *An. Fr. Chr.*, 516-517, and the monk of Evesham, 27-28, who nowhere mention the Essex men in particular, but have the King treat with all the insurgents; of Froissart who refers to a number of counties (IX. 405), and of the revocation of pardons (Rymer, *Foedera*, IV. 126).

of insurgents at any one time assembled in 1381, and Froissart's estimate of over 60,000 men seems by no means exaggerated.¹ While most of them came from the home counties, especially from Kent and Essex, there were contingents from greater distances, and representatives from as far away as Somerset and Oxford.²

In strange confidence the besiegers left only fourscore men to guard the Tower with its strong garrison; but other bands of rebels, which from all sides were hurrying on London, constantly arrived. Royal messengers urged them as they arrived to proceed to Mile End, promising that the King would soon follow.³ Meanwhile the King was urging the intended victims of the insurgents to steal through the small watergate of the Tower and escape by boat; but none, excepting the Archbishop, had the courage to make the attempt⁴. He was unfortunately recognized by a woman, who sounded the alarm, and the prelate retired in confusion to the Tower.

A considerable retinue accompanied the King to Mile End.⁵ Sir Aubrey de Vere, his swordbearer, preceded. Richard was followed by his mother, the Princess of Wales, in her chariot, by the lord constable (Buckingham), the Earls of Kent, Warwick and Oxford, Sir Thomas Percy, Sir Robert Knowles, the mayor of London, besides other knights, esquires and citizens on horseback.⁶ According to Froissart three faithful foreign peers, *viz.*, Robert de Namur, the Lords of Vertain (Hainault) and Gommegnies (Flanders), rode forth with the King.⁷ A crowd of insurgents followed. Though little more than a mile, the journey was not without peril. On

¹ *Chroniques*, IX. 404. Froissart's military experience and knowledge make his estimates of numbers quite valuable. Other sources are more exaggerated. Thus, *An. Fr. Chr.*—"A tres hideous poure, al nombre de C. M. et plusors." See also Riley, *Memorials*, 449: "Whose numbers were in all past reckoning."

² *Rot. Parl.*, III. 106 (for Somerset); *Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1381, p. 16 (for Oxford). Besides the home counties, Froissart (IX. 405) mentions people of Sussex, Bedford, Cambridge, Stafford, and Lynn; but such details of his are usually unreliable.

³ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517.

⁴ The chronicle just cited attributes their refusal to want of courage; Knighton (II. 133) states this even more strongly. They may, however, have mistrusted the King's plan of escape—an opinion justified by the failure of the Archbishop's attempt, and by the circumstance that of the lords and gentlemen mentioned as prescribed by the rebels (*An. Fr. Chr.*, 513), all except the chancellor and treasurer afterwards escaped.

⁵ Riley, *Memorials*, 449. This document, confirmed by the anonymous chronicle, and Froissart, is to be preferred to the monk of Evesham, who describes the King's retinue as small. *Ibid.*, 27.

⁶ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517.

⁷ *Chroniques*, IX. 405. On these foreign peers he was likely well informed from his Belgian sources. He adds the Earl of Salisbury to the above list, and relates how the King's two half-brothers, the Earl of Kent and Sir John Holland, stole away from the train on the road to Mile End.

Tower hill an insurgent leader, Thomas Faringdon of London, seized the bridle of the King's horse, demanding justice against the lord treasurer, who, he claimed, had robbed him of tenements in Essex. His sovereign assented to this petition.¹ Other altercations between the King's train and the people took place on the road.² At one o'clock in the afternoon,³ the hour appointed for the meeting, they arrived at Mile End.

Now as to the actual occurrences at Mile End. Our investigations have shown that Froissart's account is unreliable in detail, but that both the monk of Evesham and the anonymous French chronicler are trustworthy. We must therefore prefer the monk's account of Richard's conduct to the traditional ideas derived from Froissart. According to the former he rode timidly to the place of meeting; he is aptly compared to a lamb among wolves, and we are told that he appealed in a supplicating manner to the people standing about.⁴ This version of the subject, though perhaps exaggerated by the chronicler, is more like what we would expect of a lad of fifteen years, of the retiring disposition and rather timid character of Richard II.

The details given by the anonymous French chronicler are also

¹ *Coram Rege rolls*, publ. by Réville, 195, 204. Faringdon threatened in case justice was refused him to re-enter and hold his tenements by force.

² Thus William Treweman, a London brewer, in like manner accosted Nicholas Brembre, near Aldgate, reproaching him with injuries inflicted when the latter was mayor. *Coram Rege rolls*, Réville, 207.

³ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 516-517. The "vij del knolle," according to general medieval usages, is the seventh canonical hour, 1 p. m., and not 7 a. m. This interpretation is confirmed by the following circumstances: (1) On the same morning the chief division of the Essex men, under Jack Straw, their captain, had destroyed Highbury, an extensive manor two leagues north of London (Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 458). This division was certainly at Mile End (Riley, *Memorials*, 449; Froissart, IX. 405), which under these circumstances they could not have reached by 7 a. m. (2) The insurgents from St. Alban's had on that morning marched to London by the roundabout way of Barnet (about 25 miles), had stopped at Highbury long enough to take the oath of allegiance to the rebellion before Jack Straw, and at London to take counsel in the church of St. Mary of the Bows (*Ibid.*, 454, 467-468); yet they arrived in time for the meeting at Mile End. That they were actually there is indicated by the circumstance that we afterwards find them in possession of one of the royal pennons distributed at Mile End (*Ibid.*, 472); we also hear that their leader obtained from the King in person "*coram turba*" a grant of their demands (*Ibid.*, 468), which probably refers to the multitude at Mile End. Such a feat of marching could not have been performed between matins, directly after which they started from St. Alban's (*Ibid.*, 458), and 7 a. m. (3) The Earl of Warwick, who was hearing mass at Barnet when the insurgents of St. Alban's passed (not before 10 a. m., since Barnet is about 20 miles from St. Alban's by the road) accompanied the King to Mile End (*Ibid.*, 458; *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517). From all these circumstances it is evident that 1 p. m. is the time meant.

⁴ Mon. Evesham, 27. "Versus eos valde timidus equitavit . . . Cum dominus rex ad praedictum locum . . . venisset quasi agnus inter lupos apparuit, quippe qui de vita sua plurimum formidabat; populum circumstantem supplicite adoravit."

to be accepted. We hear that when the royal train arrived at Mile End, the commons received the King on bended knees: "Welcome, our Lord King Richard, an it please you; we desire no other King than you."¹ They were drawn up in battle array, with two great standards of St. George, banners and pennants flying before them. Walter Tyler, their spokesman, then addressed the King, insisting on two points: (1) That they might take those who were traitors to the King throughout England and put them to death, and that (2) the King grant the petitions they were about to present him, which, it seems, had been previously drawn up in writing. The King asked what their petitions were, and when Tyler enumerated them, granted every article. He then had the insurgents drawn up in two great ranks and these concessions proclaimed to them.

To these details the monk of Evesham makes further additions. We are told that the people presented their petitions through a delegation selected for this purpose, demanding confirmation by royal letters patent.² This statement is not at variance with the account just considered, as Tyler was the spokesman of the delegation. It is probable that in all important actions he had at his side a council of this nature, in which such men as John Ball, Jack Straw and other chief leaders took part. Furthermore, the chief demands of the insurgents were confirmed by just such letters patent.³ The same chronicler goes on to relate that the populace declared the King should not leave their presence until he had made this confirmation, a point well understood by both King and council.⁴ At all events, the required letters patent were solemnly promised in presence of the multitude, and the King, having obtained permission of the insurgents,⁵ retired, followed by his train. He proceeded to the Queen's wardrobe in the Tower Royal, after the Tower the strongest fortress in London.⁶

Two of the articles granted the insurgents at Mile End are preserved in the letters patent conceding them to Hertfordshire; these with two more survive in the royal order by which they were afterwards revoked, while four others are preserved by the chroniclers and the city memorial of the insurrection.⁷ The four articles pre-

¹ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517.

² Mon. Evesham, 27-28.

³ It is so stated in the revocation of pardons. Rymer, IV. 126. See also the charter sent to Hertfordshire, Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 467; Mon. Evesham, 28.

⁴ The King afterwards stated that he was forced to make these concessions; this statement was reiterated by the Parliament of November, 1381. *Rot. Parl.*, II. 99, 100.

⁵ Mon. Evesham, 28. "Ab eis licentia petita." Froissart, IX. 406.

⁶ Riley, *Memorials*, 450; Froissart, as above.

⁷ All these will be cited in course of their enumeration in the narrative.

served by the Revocation are well known, while the others, with a single exception, have heretofore been unnoticed. All of them are important as showing the character of the revolt and the objects which it strove to attain.

The first provision mentioned in the Revocation and in the letter for Hertfordshire abolishes serfdom in England.¹ The King manumits his subjects and frees them from all manner of bondage and servitude. Manumission frees the person of the serf, who is no longer bound to the soil or subject to tallage at his lord's will, but has full legal rights against him. The article goes on to abolish all forms of servile labor,² whether it be week work, harvest work or any other, rendered by freeman or by serf. Since the pestilence of 1349 had raised wages and lowered rents, such labor services were felt more keenly than before by the peasants, who on their return home everywhere withdrew them.³

In the second article the King pardons all rebellion and other offenses committed by the insurgents, all outlawry they may have incurred and extends his peace to all.⁴

The third article concedes to the manumitted serfs the right to buy and sell free of toll in all cities, boroughs, market-vills and other places.⁵ This concession is in reality included in the first article mentioned, since all freemen possessed this right. It is a distinct blow at the manorial system, which prohibited the serf from trading outside of the manor, except by special license of the lord. It is not, however, directed against the tolls and privileges of the cities and towns, since their⁶ charters, containing monopolies of trade, having been issued before, would exclude this grant. There is no complaint against the municipal economy of the period, as such, among the rebels of 1381; they had no quarrel with the craft guilds of the cities or the city governments. Indeed, one of the most powerful crafts of London, the fishmongers, and several cities like Canterbury and Bury St. Edmunds were in open alliance with the insurgents.

¹ Rymer, IV. 126. "Quod . . . universos ligeos et subditos nostros, communes et alios, certorum comitatum regni nostri manumisimus, et ipsos et eorum quemlibet ab omni bondagio et servitio exuimus et quietos fecimus," cf. Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, I. 467 (pardon for Herts); Mon. Evesham., 28. I cite the *Revocation*, which is also preserved by Walsingham (*Hist. Angl.*, II. 20-22), as giving the general form of the articles; the pardon for Herts gives a form adapted to that country. The variations are slight and unimportant.

² This interpretation is confirmed by Adam of Usk, a contemporary lawyer; *Chronicon*, 2.

³ Rymer, IV. 126 (bis.); *Archaeologia Cantiana*, II. 71-72; Mon. Evesham., 32.

⁴ Rymer, as above. Cf. *Hist. Angl.*, as above, where the wording is a little different, and the résumé in Mon. Evesham, as above.

⁵ Rymer, IV. 126. Cf. Mon. Evesham, as above.

⁶ This is the supposition of Petit-Dutaillis. Réville, LXXXVIII.

The fourth article provides for a maximum land rent of four pence the acre from lands thus freed from villenage, but the rent of no land previously held for less shall be raised in consequence of this provision.¹ This is in line with the usual medieval ideas of regulating prices. The peasants might justly reason that if Parliament could lower wages and the craft guilds could raise prices, they might limit rents. As might be expected under the circumstances, they fixed a low maximum. Some land in England rented as high as two shillings the acre, and sixpence was quite a common price.²

The four demands just enumerated are the only ones mentioned in the Revocation. All other sources describing the events at Mile End, however, are agreed that further concessions were made. Their omission in the Revocation may be best accounted for by the fact that, as they were of a political nature, they required no formal revocation, a disavowal being sufficient.³ This is true of all excepting one, the demand for the repeal of the statutes of laborers. In the disturbed state of the country at this time, the council would hardly have attempted to enforce this labor legislation, and any mention of it would have been inopportune. This demand for its repeal was one of whose existence I was convinced before this became evident from a passage in Stowe's invaluable source.⁴ Considering the importance of the statutes of laborers in bringing on the revolt, it certainly seemed unlikely that the rebels would have neglected such an opportunity for their annulment.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of these well known laws; I hope to examine that subject in another paper and show how this legislation brought on the revolt. Suffice it here to say that the statutes were not chiefly aimed, as has been usually supposed, against a separate class of agricultural laborers, but against any person who at any time worked for hire. They therefore affected the lower classes of the kingdom, the lesser craftsmen and journeymen of the towns as well as villains, cotters and copyholders in the country. The insurgents of 1381 attempted to provide a remedy for such compulsory determination of wages by the provision that henceforward no man should serve another but of his own free will and for wages by mutual agreement.⁵

¹ Rymer, as above. Mon. Evesham, as above.

² Denton, *England in 15th Century*, 147; Rogers, *Agriculture and Prices*, IV, 126.

³ The political offenses committed by the insurgents were repeatedly disavowed. Rymer, IV, 125, 126, 127; Réville, 286-287.

⁴ This was surmised in 1859 by G. Bergenroth, but without any proof. *Hist. Zeitschrift*, II, 79.

⁵ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517. "Che nul ne devoit servir ascune home, mes a sa volonte de mesme et par couenante taille."

As might be expected, the political demands of the commons are radical in the extreme. The fruits of the aggressive English policy in France were now being reaped in the shape of military disaster and heavy taxes, a fact brought vividly home to the people by the poll-tax of 1380. While it is probably true that much of this was due to the mismanagement of John of Gaunt and the party in power, it is doubtful if their opponents could have done any better. But in the popular conception of the Middle Ages—and this opinion was shared by the House of Commons—an unsuccessful minister was usually a traitor.

The insurgents had therefore on the previous day demanded the heads of most of the King's chief advisers, including the ministry,—fifteen lords and gentlemen in all. Among these were the chancellor just retired, Sir Robert Hales, the treasurer, Sir John Fordham, clerk of the privy seal, and two chief justices, Sir Robert Belknap, of the common pleas, and Sir Robert Plesynstone, chief baron of the exchequer, to say nothing of John of Gaunt, Bishop Courtenay of London, Sir Ralph Ferrers and others.¹ Stretching the term traitor to all who oppressed them or opposed their revolt, they demanded a far-reaching punishment.

Contemporaries differ as to the terms of the grant. According to the official city record the King conceded the insurgents' demands without qualification: "That they might take those who were traitors against him and slay them, wheresoever they might be found."² The anonymous French chronicler, on the other hand, records that his answer was qualified by the condition that the accused be legally convicted of treason.³ In this instance I prefer to follow the city record, considering the fact that the King was entirely at the mercy of the insurgents, who certainly would not have been satisfied thus to leave the matter to their chief enemies, the lawyers. This was certainly the understanding of the insurgents (who, by virtue of this grant, straightway proceeded to the Tower to kill the chancellor and his companions),⁴ as well as of the garrison who admitted them.

As a corollary to the provision for the punishment of a hostile ministry, the King acknowledged the insurgents' claim that he had heretofore been ill led and governed, and promised that henceforth he would be directed by them.⁵ In this grant we find the political

¹ *Ibid.*, 513.

² Riley, *Memorials*, 449.

³ *An. Fr. Chr.*, 517.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 517. "*Par celle grant le dit Wat Tighler et les comons pristeront leur voy a le toure pur prendre lercheuesque.*" Riley, 449.

⁵ Mon. Evesham, 28.

VOL. VII.—19.

ideal of the insurgents,—a popular absolute monarchy, ruled by advice of the common people. Not a word is said about Parliament and its rights, which are ignored in all of the articles. The rights of the landlords of Parliament over their villains is annulled without their consent, their property is confiscated by the radical reduction of rent. Laws which they had enacted are set aside, innocent men are hurried to death without legal trial by their peers. All these were infractions on the fundamental rights of Parliament, to which the common people no longer looked for redress or relief. By its persistence in legislation hostile to the lower classes since the first statute of laborers, in 1349, Parliament had completely estranged them; the King was their only hope.

Adam of Usk, a contemporary lawyer, records another concession at Mile End not noticed elsewhere, *viz.*, the liberation of all prisoners.¹ At this time the prisons were filled with the victims of the statutes of laborers and other repressive legislation since 1349, and it is to this circumstance, rather than to any sympathy with crime on part of the insurgents, that this demand is to be attributed.

Such were the articles granted the insurgents at Mile End. They were of course extorted, and there was no intention on part of the authorities to carry them out; such, indeed, would have been a legal impossibility. For how could the King legally dispose of the rights and property of his people without the consent of Parliament, annul laws which it had formally enacted, or decree the execution of men without legal trial? Of course, the council intended to have him disavow these concessions as soon as safety would allow. For the present they proceeded with great caution. As a pledge of the King's sincerity, royal banners and pennons were distributed among the different rebel bands,² and the articles granted were proclaimed in all the shires of England.³

It would be fruitless to speculate on the possible results had the economic demands of the peasants been enforced. I am not so sure that the suppression of the revolt, in this regard at least, was for the unquestioned good of the nation.⁴ The result of these reforms would have further weakened the landlords and emancipated the peasantry, with the possible result of a landlord system in which peasant proprietorship would have been the prevailing feature,—a

¹ "Rex concessit . . . omnes incarceratos liberari." *Chron. Adae de Usk*, 2.

² Rymer, *Foedera*, IV. 126; Froissart, IX. 405.

³ "Hoc ubique in regni comitatibus publice mandavit et fecit proclamari." *Chron. Adae de Usk*, 2.

⁴ Such is the prevailing opinion. Powell, *East Anglia Rising*, 66; Trevelyan, *Age of Wycliffe*, 255.

state of affairs which many prominent English politicians and economists since Arthur Young have been trying to bring about.

The demands of the insurgents also afford valuable information on the character and causes of the insurrection. We know from other sources that it was very complex in nature, a union of most of the elements discontented with the social order. The lower classes of the towns, in several cases the town governments, were important factors; moreover a general uprising against the monasteries took place in connection with the revolt. But from these demands extorted by the insurgents at the zenith of their power it is evident that the most important factor, the backbone of the movement, was an uprising against serfdom and servile labor; it is the villain who benefits chiefly from the concession at Mile End. True, the free peasant was not forgotten, for he too rendered labor services, sometimes such as were servile by nature, and was oppressed by the statutes of laborers. He felt more keenly than did the villain the political abuses of the day, since he had some share in the government. But except in so far as he might be benefited by the repeal of the statutes of laborers, the townsman receives no consideration in these articles. From this alone, if we had no other evidence, we should know that the political and economic aspirations of the peasantry of England constituted the chief factors of the revolt in 1381.

GEORGE KRIEHN.

A BRITISH PRIVATEER IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"I'm informed that you have had such Success with your Privateer that the Men of War are got jealous of her taking too many Prizes and have endeavoured to sink her, c'est bien malhonête!" And so beyond question, thought that honest Scotch merchant and ardent loyalist, John Porteous,¹ of New York, in September, 1779, when he read the Montreal letter, written by his old-time friend, James Sterling, from which the sentence is quoted. Their friendship was of long standing, dating back to the fur-trading days that followed the close of the French War, when they had been partners at Detroit in the Indian trade and in many adventures on those distant trails that brought wealth from the great northern wilderness. Soon after the British army had occupied New York in 1776, John Porteous had followed it thither and had established himself in general merchandizing, occupying the store belonging to Henry Remsen, at No. 513 Hanover Square, "next door to the Admiral's." He enjoyed a good credit with his London connections; his brother, James Porteous, was an Assistant Commissary General in the British service, and the shrewd and thrifty Scotchman seems to have prospered in his undertakings. He preserved most of his papers with methodical care, and after his death, by some fortunate accident they escaped destruction, until, covered with a century's dust, they were recently brought to light from the old chest where they had so long lain hidden. There are many curious stories which these time-stained records tell, and among

¹ John Porteous came from Perth, Scotland, to America about the year 1761, and was one of the early British traders at Detroit and Michilimacinae. He was a resident of Detroit during its siege by Pontiac and for ten years thereafter. During this time he was engaged in the Indian trade as a partner with James Sterling in the firm of Duncan, Sterling and Porteous, and later formed a partnership with the firm of Phyn and Ellice, of Schenectady, N. Y. Before the opening of the Revolutionary War he went to Montreal, and after the British occupied New York City, he followed them there and carried on a general merchandizing business until the evacuation in 1783, when he returned to Scotland. Soon thereafter he settled in Nova Scotia, but in 1788 or 1789 went to Little Falls, N. Y., where he represented the interests of Alexander Ellice, who had succeeded to the lands covered by the Vaughn patent. He was naturalized in 1790, and lived at Little Falls until his death in March, 1799.

The papers forming the basis of this article were discovered among other business papers of Porteous in Buffalo, New York, and are now in the possession of the writer.

them is the story of the British Privateer "Vengeance," as told by those who shared her varied fortunes.

When Cornwallis entered Philadelphia in September, 1777, the opportunity seemed favorable for the British traders, and shortly thereafter John Porteous sent a stock of goods to that city entrusted to his friend and associate, John Richardson, who took a shop in Market street, where he had important dealings with Sir William Howe and many beside. The firm of John Porteous and Co. apparently owned at this time a snow called the "Elegante," of which Captain George Dean was the master, in which their shipments back and forth were made. Possibly our worthy Scotchman's close proximity to the "Admiral" may have turned his thoughts to other naval ventures than these peaceful sailings of the seas; perhaps he was like Dogberry, "a fellow that hath had losses," for once again from London, James Sterling wrote: "Pray how do you succeed in Privateering? I hope you've caught some of the Myneers¹ who will help to reimburse your former Losses." Perhaps privateering may have seemed as profitable at that time as it was popular, for in the year 1778 it was evidently determined to convert the peaceful "Elegante" into a more war-like craft, rechristened the "Vengeance," which, on the 17th of November, for a consideration of £37 6s. 8d. was duly commissioned as a privateer under the seal of the court of vice-admiralty for the province of New York, "to attack, Surprize, Seize and take all Ships and Vessels, Goods, Wares and Merchandizes, Chattels and Effects whatsoever belonging to the Inhabitants of the American Colonies in Rebellion."

A "snow" was a three masted vessel, having abaft the main mast, a third mast which carried a trysail. The "Vengeance" was a vessel of this class and was no beauty despite her original name; for one witness said she looked "like a Hog Trough," and another is equally disrespectful concerning her appearance, but, as the record shows, her good qualities far out-balanced this lack of grace. She was well armed, carrying six six-pound guns and eight four-pounders, with an abundance of small arms and ammunition, and, as appears from the details of her equipment, was amply supplied with provisions and with rum. The surgeon's instruments cost £18 16s. and her stock of medicines £76 4s. 6d. There had been added by purchase a new long boat which had cost £37 6s. 8d.; a pinnace costing £25, and at the hour of sailing, a very fine small boat which Captain Dean said he "could not possibly do without" for which John Porteous paid a round twenty guineas. Altogether, the vessel

¹ [Mynheers, evidently referring to Dutch merchantmen. The letter is dated 1781. Ed.]

and her outfit when ready for sea represented an outlay to her owners of £4851 10s. 8d., York currency, equivalent at the time to about £3300 sterling. Of officers and crew there were sixty-nine on board when she sailed, with George Dean, Captain; George Knowles, 1st Lieut.; Charles Knowles, 2nd Lieut.; Thomas Middleton, master; John Fitzgerald, surgeon; John Fraser, gunner; and Patrick Henvey, boatswain, and including also John Richardson, who, like Captain Dean, was a shareholder and who went ostensibly to guard the owners' interests, but evidently moved by a fine spirit of adventure and bearing rank as captain of marines. To his facile pen and to that of the pugnacious captain, we are indebted for the most graphic account that has been preserved of the experiences of a British privateer during the war of the American Revolution.

By the 9th of January, 1779, all was ready, so that the "Vengeance" dropped down the bay and at three o'clock in the afternoon of the following day John Richardson found an opportunity of sending a farewell message from Sandy Hook.—"Yesterday afternoon it blowing fresh and the wind contrary we came to an Anchor off the Watering Place at Staten Island; and about 12 O'Clock today got under weigh;—we shall be abreast of the Man of War very soon and Capt: Dean is determined to proceed immediately to Sea on passing inspection." He concludes by "ardently hoping for a successful Cruize," and is not again heard from until the 15th of February when the "Vengeance" is in the latitude of Port Royal. At least one letter had been dispatched in the interim by the first prize captured, but as there is no trace of its receipt, and as the "Little Ben" never found a place on the credit side of the "Vengeance's" account, it is probable that the prize was re-captured before reaching New York. Captain Dean now writes:

VENGEANCE Lat: 32°.15' N. 15th Feb^r 1779

Dear Sir

My last was dated the 5th Current p^r the Prize Schooner *Little Ben* from Cape Fear bound to Boston John Anderson Prize Master, who I hope before this reaches you will have arrived safe. She was loaded with Tar Turpentine and Rice, is quite full and about 80 Tons burthen. On the 14th January 3 Sail of Vessels were Captured by the Privateers Experiment, Cap^t. McPherson, and Gen^l. Mathew, Cap^t. Forsyth, in sight of us and within hearing of the Guns; which you'll please lay in a claim for a Proportion of according to Men and Guns. One was a dismasted Ship from Cape François bound to Charlestown, loaded with Rum etc., another a Brig, and the third a Schooner which we chased in to them. All were taken off the Capes of Virginia, and it was my intention to put

some People on board them which being signified to Capt: Forsyth he even assented to coming too or laying by till morning when we would see each other again, but it growing hazy in the night, they gave us the Slip, next day we saw them again and fired several shot at the Sloop Genl. Mathew to bring her too, but without effect, however I am in hopes this ungenerous method of procedure will avail them little. On the 8th Curl. Captured the Ship Geo: Washington mounting 10 double fortified 4 pounders from Boston in Balast bound to Charlestown which I have ordered for Savannah in Georgia (it being in our possession) consigned to Mr. John Tunno, who is connected with Mr. Penman at St. Augustine, as Agent; She is 440 Tons burthen Frigate built and a beautiful Vessel. I remain with respect

Your sincere friend and hble Serv^t.

GEORGE DEAN

Accompanying this was a letter from John Richardson.

VENGEANCE Lat: 32° 15' N. 15th Feb. 1779.

Dear Sir

I wrote you the 5th Current a few Lines. This will be delivered you by a Mr. J. [1?] Mitchell of Boston, who was a Passenger on board the *Geo: Washington*; is a Portrait Painter and was intending by some means or other to get to England. Being a facetious young Fellow, and in all appearance a friend to Govl. Capl. Dean and all the officers on board the Vengeance have shown him every indulgence and civility, and make no doubt you will do the like. We at first took the Washington for a 40 Gun Ship she loomed so large, but upon getting a little nearer, saw she was a large Merchantman, which we were in hopes was French. She showed 14 Guns, besides 2 on her Quarter Deck. We were determin^d to have a look at her, and accordingly stood towrd her under French Colours; she at same time bearing down on us under Rebel Colours; She by Accident made part of our Signal, which inducing us to believe she was the Union of Liverpool, we hoisted English; this caused her immediately to haul her Wind from us; and convinced us she was an enemy; it falling calm, we happily thought of trying what effect our Boats Oars would have in rowing the Snow. Our people being in high spirits pulled like heroes; We gained on her considerably, and she kept pelting us with Stern Chacer which happily did little damage altho' almost every shot took place in our Sails. We fired only three Shot at her, and rowed up under her stern, fired our Stink Pot and prepared for boarding; but before we came within hail she struck. Upon get^t nearer hailed her, and finding her from Boston gave three Cheers, which to our no small surprize was returned by a number on board the Ship. We found she was manned mostly with Scotchmen, whom the Captain had got out of Prison Ships. They rejoiced in their releasement; and with some others to the Number of 21 entered with us. On the afternoon of the 9th Curl saw 2 Sail which gave chace to. Soon perce^d one to be a

large Ship stand^e for us. Apprehending her to be the Deane Frigate who came out of Boston with our Prize, kept close by the wind; but about 7 in the evening it being then dark found she was close under our Lee crossing us with her Larboard Tacks on board—we having our Starboard. She gave us a Gun: We returned her a 6 pounder shotted, yet I believe hit her—which was no sooner done than she gave us, and our Prize who was close under our Stern a Broadside and a Volley from her Tops and Quarter Deck, Luckily they did very little damage except to our Sails; but find^e them 9 pounders, were now convinced she was the Rebel frigate mentioned above; so Cap^t Dean and Officers, judged it most prudent to stand on. She immediately Tacked in our wake and stood after us. About 10 at night it falling light winds perceived she gained upon us; so finding it in vain to get clear, hauled up our Courses and prepared for Action along with our Prize; who was at this time commanded by Geo: Knowles, who I forgot to mention returned the Frigates broadside. She came up within Hail with all Sails standing, when we found it was his Majesty's Ship Unicorn, who behaved in a very civil manner. We were then off Cape Roman. Mess^r. Knowles join in best respects to you and Brother and I remain with unfeigned regard

Your sincere friend and humble Servant

JOHN RICHARDSON

P. S. We spoke Cap^t M^rAlpin in a Schooner from New York who informed us you was well M^r. Andrews is gone Prize Master of the Ship who sails almost as well as we. Convoyed her almost to Georgia.

By an endorsement in his autograph, it appears that these letters were opened at New York by Commodore (afterward Admiral) Sir Hyde Parker, before being delivered to John Porteous to whom they were addressed. In December, 1778, Hyde Parker had commanded the small squadron which conveyed the British troops under Lt. Col. Archibald Campbell to the capture of Savannah, a service for which Parker was knighted in 1779. This important southern port now being in possession of the British, and the province declared to be "in the King's peace," Captain Dean thought it best to touch at Savannah for supplies and to see what had become of his fine prize ship, so about the 5th of March the "Vengeance" dropped anchor in the Savannah river and ten days later letters to New York told of the condition of her affairs which were not wholly to the Captain's liking.

SAVANNAH RIVER IN GEORGIA)
ON BOARD THE VENGEANCE) 15th March 1779.

Dear Sir

Finding our Stock of Wood and Water to be getting rather short I determined to put into this place to get a recruit of these articles: It

was likewise some inducement to me to learn the fate of the Ship *Geo: Washington* (which we took on the 8th Feb^r bound from Boston to Charlestown in Balast) who by a Vessel we spoke with at Sea we were informed that she was claimed as British Property. M^r Tunno who I appointed Agent, and I dare say you remember to have seen at New York, as he lodged at M^r. Stoughton's dispatched her Papers to S^t. Augustine without delay, no Court of Admiralty being established here till within these few days: No answer is yet arrived but I am in hopes the claim will not be sustained, as the Claimant is a man of no character, and I have reason to believe was in a great measure induced to it by the Prize Master, *Charles Andrews*, who has proved a most cunning artful villain, and has done I find everything in his power to stir up sedition among the Ships Company—who were however proof against it and are a set of as fine peaceable fellows as ever manned a Ship. If I can find any Point Blank proof against him of making away with anything out of the Ship I will trounce him soundly for it—at any rate he and I shall never float at sea again in the same bottom. I shall order M^r. Tunno to remit you whatever may be the Nett Proceeds of the Ship, after deducting disbursements here, without delay, when she is sold. I had once determined on going as far as £3000 Sterling for her on our own account, as she sails very fast and would carry 24 Guns, six pounders with ease, but upon more mature deliberation have given up thoughts of that as the Expence of sending her round, and fitting would be so immense, that I am determined to stick by the *Old Vengeance*, who without jesting I would not exchange, for our business, with any Privateer belonging to New York: I find her to be possessed of every qualification necessary for a Privateer—Sails fast, carries her Guns well, makes no more water in a Gale of Wind than in a Calm; and in appearance at best but a Bundle of Boards. I am anxious to hear of the arrival at your Place of the Schooner *Little Ben* from Cape Fear bound to Boston, which we took on the 4th February, and of the *Snow Invermay* from Cape François, bound to Charlestown, Captured the 19th d^e; the first loaded with Tar, Turpentine and Rice, the latter with Rum, Sugar, Coffee and Dry Goods. There were a few trifling articles taken out of the *Snow* besides what I mentioned, which in the hurry we were in I forgot, viz the *Jesuits' Bark*—pieces, Linen, I made a present of to the Master. No bread being to be had here, I have purchased as a substitute 15 Tierces Rice at 7/6 Stg. pr. C, and some sweet Potatoes. I shall buy only, about 10 Barrels Salt Provision, which can be had for about 6 Guineas pr Bbl; but as it is far cheaper and better for the people as many Hogs (which can be got about 3^d stg. pr lb.) as I can conveniently carry on Deck out of the way of the Guns. I am afraid I shall be obliged to get a puncheon of Rum altho' dear; there is no doing without it in our way. We were once entirely out for eight days, but to do our People justice I never heard the least murmur on that account as they knew it could not be had.

One circumstance happened to us in the Beginning of the Cruize, which I cannot omit mentioning every opportunity altho' I can hardly do it with patience. If ever any one serves me such a Trick again, I will forgive him and never mention a word about it. On the 14th January a dismasted Ship from Cape Francois, bound to Charlestown, loaded with Taffia, etc, a Brig with her Main Topmast gone, and a Schooner, were captured off the Capes of Virginia by the Experiment Cap^t. M'Pherson and Gen^l. Mathew, Cap^t. Forsyth, both of New York, in sight of us and within hearing of their Guns. I spoke them and intended putting Prize Masters on board in the morning, which I even signified to Capt. Forsyth who appeared to have no objection, and agreed to lay by till morning—however it getting hazy in the night they gave us the Slip. Next day I saw them again and fired several shot to bring them to; upon which they put away before the wind. I hauled our wind for the Prizes, and put about when I thought we had got so far as to be able to fetch them on the other Tack, however we saw nothing more of them. I am hopeful some of my Letters may have reached you to enable you to lay in a claim for a share of said Prizes according to Men and Guns. I have cut out 2 more Ports, and got two four Pounders out of the Ship, and we now mount 6 six pounders and 10 four pounders. When we go out we shall have 70 Men, all fine fellows; almost 50 of whom are Seamen, and we shall not carry a man out here but what belonged to us when we came in; so that you see we have been very lucky in the Vessels we have taken to get so many seamen. I remain with great regard

Dear John

Yours sincerely

GEORGE DEAN

There were uncertainties even in British privateering. The "Vengeance" might capture cargoes of rum and peaceful tar-laden merchantmen, but there were many things to be reckoned with before they could be taken into port, condemned and sold and their proceeds comfortably divided. There were well-armed Yankee ships with names fully as fierce as her own, whose captains would have delighted in a brush with the "Vengeance" herself, and who, failing this, found a peculiar pleasure in recapturing her prizes, which doubtless furnishes the providential reason why the "Invermay" as well as the "Little Ben" never figured further in the privateer's accounts. Then too there were such rascally schemes as that of the "George Washington's" prize master which stirred up Captain Dean's righteous indignation, as well it might, for although full details of procedures are not found, all that was ever credited to the account of the "Vengeance" in realization of her hopes from her splendid 440 ton prize for which Captain Dean would have paid £3000 sterling, was a beggarly item of "£374

10s. 6d." "for share of the George Washington salvage." However, all were now greatly elated with their early successes and their first lieutenant, George Knowles, who had been a merchant captain, wrote to John Porteous in exuberant phonetics.

"You will No Doubt hear mor larg from Cap^t. Dean of our Sucess and the Plisur the Snow gives ous in hir saling and Every thing that wie cann wish wie have goot a Complet Sette of gunes as aney Ship out of New York sixtin sixes and four Pounders and I hoap for to have thre or four prises in to you in the Spece of thre or four weakes after our puting from thence. Wie have a Compleat Shipes Company as Ever I sailed with 70 in number."

At the same time John Richardson also wrote to Mr. Porteous.

SAVANNAH RIVER IN GEORGIA }
ON BOARD THE VENGEANCE } 15th March 1779

Dear Sir

We have been here now about 10 days, getting a fresh supply of Wood and Water, and some provisions, which are tolerably reasonable. I am hopeful the next prize we send you may be a good S^t. Domingo Man: Let us only see a Vessel and we are not afraid but we will soon come up with her, provided night does not prevent us. We sail exceedingly fast (having beat everything we have yet seen but the Unicorn) and are the greatest deception imaginable, looking at a distance like a Hog Trough; this no doubt will be a great advantage to us. The Master of the Snow we took told us, that even after he was in the Boat coming on board us, he secretly repented not having run longer; as he could hardly satisfy himself that we could sail *tolerably*, notwithstanding we had come up with him so fast that he did not know how to behave. M. Watson from New York informed us that it was currently reported there, our being cast away. I feel exceedingly for the distress and anxiety of mind you must have laboured under till the doubts respecting our safety were removed. There were people in New York, viz M^r. Pherson and Forsyth, who could have satisfied you on this head, but knowing themselves guilty of wronging us in a very ungenerous manner, I suppose they determined to keep their own counsel, for fear enquiries might be made, that would put it out of their power to conceal any longer, our being in company, when the prizes were taken; and of consequence fully entitled to a share. I have sent you all the news Papers since the arrival of our Troops here, so that it is unnecessary to mention any news. The Phoenix Man of Warsailed for England the 12th Cur^t. Col: Campbell went Passenger in her, and I suppose there never was a Commander whose departure was more regretted, he being universally beloved by all orders of People. Cap^t. Dean and I being in Town when the Molly Cap^t. Thompson sailed for New York prevented our writing by her, as likewise to London by the Phoenix, not expect^t they would sail so soon.

This is the best Bar Harbour in America, having over it at Low Water

at least 3 fathoms. The Bar lies near 3 miles without the Light House or rather Beacon, which is built of Brick and Whitewashed; It consists of seven Stories, and stands upon the North Eastermost Point of Tybee, a low swampy Island, uninhabited, and abound^d with fine Pine and Live Oak Trees; Here we get whatever Spars we want (upon asking liberty) for the trouble of cutting them. About 3 miles up from the Light House is Cockspur Island which divides the River into 2 channels, the northernmost of which is the Ship Channel but between the Southside of the Island and Tybee is the best Anchorage. From Cockspur to within 5 miles of Savannah Town runs a range of swampy desert Islands, dividing the Channels as I ment^d before. The Banks of the River on both sides untill you come near to the Town (which is about 20 miles from Tybee Beacon) is a swamp. Here you can see multitudes of alligators lying in the mud like old Logs, and the Rivers in general here so abound with these destructive animals that it is very dangerous to go in to the Water. The Town stands upon a steep sandy Bank, which will put a man out of breath before he can reach the Top of it. It consists of about 300 houses, built for the most part of Wood. It is very regularly laid out, the Streets crossing each other at right angles, but like most other Towns in this Country very straggling built. The Streets are not paved; the Sand in them is near a foot deep, and in the summer, what between Sand Flies (of which even now there are Legions) Musquetoes etc *must certainly be a most agreeable place* to reside in. When it blows, a man runs no small risk of being choaked by the clouds of sand and dust. I am told that about 50 miles back, the Country exhibits a very different appearance, being very fruitful in Indigo, Rice, Indian Corn etc., and abounds with stock of all kinds; The sallow complexion of the Natives here, to me sufficiently proves the unhealthiness of the Climate. Mr. Michie desires his Compliments to you, he is in company with Mr. Brown, and they seem to have a great run. There is a pretty good demand for Goods here. Mr. McCulloch is appointed Collector of the Customs. Col: Innes is gone home. Mr. Penman¹ from St. Augustine is here. Of Privateers there are at present here, the Mars Cap^t. Cunningham, Union Cap^t. Sibrell, and Surprize Cap^t. Watson, all of New York. Cap^t. Henry of the Fowey is now Commodore. I beg to be remembered to your Brother, Mr. Cruden: Mr. and Mr. Groome. I remain with the greatest regard

Dr. Sir

Yours very sincerely

JOHN RICHARDSON

During the month that followed these despatches, the "Vengeance" found business very dull. The rich St. Domingo mer-

¹ James Penman, a British loyalist, who was engaged in business at St. Augustine, Fla., until the capture of Savannah, Ga., in 1779, where he accompanied the British General, Augustine Prevost from Florida. After the capture of Savannah in 1779 and in the effort to re-establish the royal government there he was appointed a member of the council and a commissioner of claims under the Crown.

chantman wisely kept out of her way; she caught a glimpse of the Jamaica fleet sailing down the Georgia coast and somewhere thereabouts captured a "light brig," only to lose it again. Letters were sent by a St. Augustine sloop, but it would seem that they never reached New York and the next despatches received by the owners were written May 7th, somewhere off Albemarle Sound.

ON BOARD THE VENGEANCE Lat 36° North

D^r Sir

On the 2^d Cur^r we in Company with the Privateer Sloop Who would have thought it, Cap^t. Lancefield belonging to M^r. Courtney, took the Schooner Fannie, John Sawyer Master from S^t. Croiz bound to Edenton, mounting 4 Carriage Guns and 3 Swivels, loaded with 78 Puncheons Rum and 1 Hhd. Sugar. There is likewise on board some small Casks Rum and Pieces of Dry Goods as annexed. I intended keeping her with me for some Days to Cruize as she would have answered every purpose of a Tender and for that Purpose put 6 of our best people on Board including the 1st Lieut. and the Sloop put the same number of his: but not obeying my signal for Tacking the ensuing night (whether from intention or neglect I know not) we lost Company of her, and heard nothing of her since. This has distressed me exceedingly to loose so many good men in so small a vessel and as I was in Chase all the afternoon had not time to make out M^r. Knowles's Orders, or send a Copy of our Commission, but Verbally desired him to keep by us. However I am hopeful she may arrive safe at New York as I have no doubt they will push directly for thence. On the 4th Cur^r I sent about 30 Volunteers on board the said Sloop and in our Pinnace, who went into Ocracock Harbour, boarded and took the French Polacco Ship Le Hardy Claude Berard M^r of 12 Carriage Guns, 4 Swivels and 26 Men, after a very obstinate resistance. We did not loose a Man, having only one a good deal Burnt by a Powder Flask, and the Sloop one of her people badly wounded in the head. The French Captⁿ and 3 of his People are dangerously wounded. She has on board 250 Hhds of Tobacco which I am hopeful will sell well being of the first Quality. The Ship is excellently found and sails very fast. There is a fine parcel of Bread aboard which should be glad you would purchase for our next Cruize. We shall come in for a great part of both Vessels as we had 63 Men on Board and 17 Carriage Guns, and the Sloop 6 Guns and about 26 men. Had the Schooner remained with me I should have been able to have cut out likewise a large Lumber loaded Ship which lay about 3 miles further up, who got under Sail and went still farther as soon as they saw our Intention against the Polacco. Our Water and Provisions begin to grow low, so that I shall not be able to cruize much longer. I am sorry to hear the light Brig we took and sent for Georgia, was retaken by the Brig Notre Dame of 16 Guns belonging to Charlestown, off Savannah Bar. I was so sure of her arriving safe that I would have insured her for sixpence. Should I catch any more of the Boston Victuallers (as we call them) I shall not hesitate

about burning them, as I cannot find they ever carry anything but a few notions. There is nothing I regret so much as not leaving orders with you to Commission for a good night Glass; it would have been of infinite service to me, however it may not yet be too late, therefore beg you will do it. Should the Schooner arrive, I request you will defer selling her till we arrive as I have a great opinion of her, and if the cruize can afford it, would like to purchase her for a Tender, finding that a small one would be of vast service. I am with respect, D^r. Sir

Your very humble Servant

GEORGE DEAN.

M^r. John Porteous.

P. S. M^r. Middleton the Master is sent as Prize Master of the Polacco who was altered from a Snow into a Ship lately at Edenton.

In the cabin of the Schooner

2 P^r Coating

2 P^r Broad Cloth with Shalloon and other Trimmings

In the hold about 400^{lb} Coffee

ON BOARD THE VENGEANCE Lat 36° N

7th May 1779

D^r Sir

I wrote you the 22^d ultimo pr the Hunter Sloop Cap^t. Browne from St. Augustine and mentioned having seen the Jamaica fleet on the 16th April in and about Lat: 31-30 and Lon: 70° West. On the 26th April in the morning off Cape Look Out we gave Chace to a Sail which we soon discovered to be a brig standing towards us, but before we could see her hull she Tacked and stood from us with all Sail; we continued the Chace and falling almost calm we got out our Sweeps, and about 1 P M our Pinnace armed and manned as usual was dispatched after her; We came up very fast, but most unluckily about 2 a very heavy squall with Rain from the N W came on, in which the Snow loosing sight both of us and the Brig was obliged to heave too for fear of loosing us. We returned to the Snow, and the Boat was immediately hoisted in. About 5 in the evening We again discovered the Brig who had wore (when out of our sight) towards the Shore, and went close under the Shoals, by which means she had got about 2 Leagues to Windward. We continued the Pursuit and about night it falling calm; our Pinnace was hoisted out again and sent after her; We rowed directly towards her for 2½ hours when seeing no appearance of a sail, M^r. Knowles and I judged it prudent to return. Got on board the Vessel about 1 next morning; it still continuing almost calm set out again and at Sun Rise discovered her at an Anchor under the Fort at Cape Lookout we returned the third time when a light breeze springing up the Snow wrought in Shore towards an Inlet (about 12 miles from the Cape) where we saw a number of Vessels laying. We hoisted French colours and made a signal for a Pilot. A Boat came out and reconnoitred us but no scheme could bring her along side. Captain Dean now was determined to have a Dust with the Brig, which

we saw was a Rebel Priv^t from 12 to 16 Guns, and accordingly stood within Gun Shot of the Fort who fired a Shot at us, which we returned, but most unluckily the Wind shifting to the Southward; we were obliged to turn out being in such a Bight, that we could not weather the Land on one Hand nor the Shoals on another. Although blowing fresh in the night; by next morning got so far to Windward as to be out of danger. We then fell in with our present consort; and determined on attempting to have the Brig at all events as she had cost us so much trouble. But on the 29th a heavy Gale driving us into the Gulf Stream, we never could fetch to Windward of the Shoals again; therefore Cap^t. Dean bent his Attention towards Ocracock—where on the 4th Cur^t. we cut out the Polacco Ship Le Hardy: M^r. Middleton the Master, and I with 16 hands went Volunteers in the Sloop: and Chas. Knowles, Gunner, and Boatswain with 9 more of our People in the Boat. The Ship having a suspicion of us had got chace Ports cut out the night before and every preparation made. We went up under her stern when he began a heavy fire on us with his Stern Chacer; and by backing his Mizen Topsail endeavoured to bring his broadside to bear on us, but being unable to effect this he renewed the fire with his chacer; Havg. by this time got pretty near, we soon drove them from those Guns by our Musketry and a 3 Pd^r. which raked him. Passing under his Starboard Quarter we laid him aboard directly and the Boat on the other; at which instant he discharged his Broadside a volley of small arms and some Powder Flasks at the Sloop. Most miraculously and providentially they did us no damage to speak of and before they could load again so many from both Sloop and Boat got on board, that little opposition was then made but by the French Cap^t., who behaved in a most resolute manner. Notwithstanding the extreme difficulty of the Bar (being only about 13 feet Water on it) we got her safe out about dark. The Channel lies so close to the Beach that the Pilots lying behind the Sand Banks peppered away at us with small arms, but did no hurt. You must look upon it as very unaccountable and indeed what I could hardly have believed had I not been an eye Witness that only one Man should be wounded and another a good deal burnt with a Powder Flask on our side. The French Cap^t. and 3 of his People are badly wounded, and several more slightly. If our Prize Schooner had been with us, to have gone in with the Sloop we should have effected something more capital. We cannot cruize above a fortnight longer as our Prov^t and Water get low, and our Bottom is remarkably foul. Present my Copt^s to your Brother—as likewise Don^t M^rLean, A.^s Stephen—and acquaintances at your Mess. Expecting to enjoy the pleasure of seeing you soon, I am

D^r Sir

Yours very sincerely

JOHN RICHARDSON

Enclosed with these letters is a list of the French prisoners captured, and also lists of the officers and men belonging to the

"Vengeance" that were on board the pinnacle and the sloop during the action.

This was a fine stroke of luck for the British privateer, inasmuch as both the polacca "Le Hardy" and the schooner "Fannie" escaped re-capture, and, having been condemned and sold at New York, the "Vengeance" was credited with £4,603 3s. 10d. as her share of the proceeds. But, alas for the mutability of fortune! Just as this audacious rover of the seas was turning homeward for renewed supplies and a fresh start in further buccaneering, she encountered disaster as unexpected and startling as lightning would have been coming from a clear sky. She was on the lookout for her enemies, and with a fighting captain and willing crew, or with swift heels, as circumstances might require, felt reasonably secure; but if her captain prayed at all, he might well change his supplications now and pray to be delivered from his friends, for it was into their hands that the "Vengeance" fell, with results undreamed of from the worst of her foes. The story is told by the original draft from the hand of John Richardson, which was evidently copied and signed by officers and crew in the vain hope of possible redress at the hands of His Britannic Majesty's government:

On Friday 21st May 1779 Between 6 and 7 P M saw Two Sail Bearing about E. standing towards us, which we conjectured to be some of the Rebel Cruizers, but being so near dark could not determine their Size. The Tryon Brig Cap^t Sibbles and we kept close together and Hauled our Wind for them, which the Brig Diana (from Surinam for New York whom we had spoke in the forenoon,) observing, bore down towards us for protection. About 9 P M we observed them close to us on our Starboard Bow, and the Leewardmost who appeared the largest seemed to be running athwart us—upon which we kept away a little and fired a Gun across his Forefoot to bring him too to speak with him. Having soon after shot up abreast of him, he Hauled his Wind on the same Tack as we (viz the Wind at Starboard) and appeared to be a very large Ship. We hailed him when he answered the Harcourt, Store Ship from London, and Cap^t Dean then repeatedly and distinctly replied the Vengeance a Privateer belonging to New York George Dean Commander. He ordered us to "Hoist out our Boat or he would fire a Broadside into us"; Cap^t Dean answered: If you will take in your Top Gallant Sails and shorten sail I will do it immediately: Then says he "lower down your Topsails," which was done and afterwards without any other warning he poured into us a whole Broadside of Round and Grape, and Volleys of small Arms and Swivels from her three Tops and Poop. We now saw her to be a two Decker and by the light could plainly perceive the English Colours: Cap^t Dean during this repeatedly hailed and told him we were a friend to the British Flag which had been displayed before coming near him, but he paid not the smallest attention to it—some of the

people say they Heard repeated orders given on Board the Ship to "fire alow and aloft, and be sure to Hull her." Our People seeing themselves doomed to destruction without mercy, said they might at least have the satisfaction of returning the fire, therefore notwithstanding Capl Dean's repeated orders to the contrary fired the greatest part of our Broadside, and it was with the utmost difficulty they were stopt as they saw no hopes of Quarters. Not satisfied with one Broadside he continued in the same manner near half an hour untill he discharged at least five into us. The Tryon being a little way astern began to fire after the Ship's second Broadside, but stopt on being hailed by Capl Dean and told that it was a British Man of War. All these things he well paid no attention to altho' he must have heard us not being half the distance we were from the Brig, and notwithstanding it was repeatedly told him who we were, and that we were sinking. At last he stopt and we finding several Shot between Wind and Water, the Carpenters reported their apprehensions of being unable to keep the Vessel up: upon which Capl Dean again hailed them, and they answering he begged them to send their Boats as we were Sinking to save the People, but not the smallest notice was taken of it. Being apprehensive of his going to begin his horrid work again our Boat was hoisted out as soon as the shattered situation of the Vessel would allow and the 2^d. Lieu^t. and Copies of our Commission sent on Board: Instead of expressing the least contrition for his Conduct, his Language only seemed to indicate his being sorry that he had not sunk us all. They asked how many we had killed or wounded, however our officer going away on such a hurry could not give particular information on that head, but said he wished to get back as soon as possible, as he was afraid before that time we had gone down; In answer to this he was informed he must first go on board the Frigate and the Ship instead of bearing down to us to afford the assistance which humanity even to Rebels would have dictated, kept his Wind and went from us with the other Vessels. The officers in the Frigate behaved with great complaisance to our officer showed great compassion for us and offered to send their Surgeons in case we had none. During the absence of our Boat we happily found on more particular examination that our Hull was not so much damaged as we imagined, and got the Holes plugged up. All the Comfort our Boat brought us was that it was His Majesty's Ship Renown of 50 Guns Capl. Dawson with orders to keep *by him* all night (which was a thing not in our power, our Vessel having almost everything shot to pieces and entirely out of command) as there were several Rebel Frigates cruising there, and pretended that he understood we hailed from Boston, and took us for them, altho' we were within Pistol Shot all the time.

Honour forbid asking Protection from such a Man; the Enemy we were not afraid of, as for upwards of 8 days we had been cruising along that Coast for the purpose of falling with some of their Privateers to have revenge for the loss of 3 of our Prises amissing and imagined to be retaken by them and at any rate it was impossible they could use us worse:

The Relation is tiresome, and for the sake of Human Nature it were to be wished that such Conduct was buried in perpetual oblivion ; but Justice forbids it and the Honour of Britain requires that such wanton and unprovoked cruelty, unworthy of a Briton, and for the Mischief produced by which Barbarity itself would even drop a Tear ; should be held up to Mankind in its true and genuine light. Cap^l. Dean received a contusion in his left hand. One fine young lad wounded by a Musket Ball which penetrated his left Arm near the Shoulder, and breaking the Collar Bone, lodged in the right side of his Neck : the Ball was happily cut out, but it is much to be feared it will prove mortal : Another had his left Arm from the Shoulder Blade to the Elbow, shattered all to pieces by a Cannon Ball in a most shocking manner ; his Wound is likewise mortal : and a third had his left shoulder Blade grazed by a Grape Shot or Ball which took off the Flesh from the other and part of the Bone, and in all appearance his Fate will be the same as the others. We were hulled in nine places ; our Main Mast almost entirely shot away about 9 feet from the Deck by a 24 pounder ; our Foremast wounded very much about the middle, our Main Cap gone, several of our Yards hurt ; and our Boats, Sails, Standing and running rigging near entirely ruined. In short Words are insufficient to describe the Horrid scene. The damage is great and cannot possibly be ascertained, as besides the expence of refitting the Vessel it has knocked up our Cruize. The Tryon happily received no further Damage than 2 or 3 people slightly wounded Cap^l. Sibles humanely offered us every assistance and staid by us till next day, when we had got our Main Mast fished and our other Damage so far repaired as to be able to make a Shift to get to New York. We likewise must not forget to mention Cap^l. Philips of the *Diana*, who staid in sight of us till next forenoon when finding us still afloat, he naturally concluded, the only assistance in his power which was to save the people in case of our sinking could not be longer requisite.

On Board the *Snow Vengeance* Saturday 22^d May 1779.

Signed by

When, a few days later, the "*Vengeance*" sighted *Sandy Hook*, it was not to make that triumphant return towards which her officers and crew had looked with jubilant expectation ; instead, she crept up the Narrows disabled and humiliated and anchored at New York as one who has been wounded seeks a hospital. During the three or four months that followed it cost a pretty penny to repair the damage wrought by Captain Dawson of His Britannic Majesty's Ship "*Renown*," but the renovation went steadily forward. The prize schooner "*Fannie*" was purchased at public sale for an even £500 and fitted up to serve as a tender for the "*Vengeance*." New cordage, new spars, new sails and anchors were provided for both ; two new "double fortified 4 pounders" were bought at a cost of £100 ; powder ammunition costing £672 1s.

rod. were added to that which remained from the first cruise; a new boat was purchased for £84; the "good night glass" was not forgotten; abundant provisions were supplied, including the "parcel of bread from the *Le Hardy*" which Captain Dean had desired and when the privateer and her tender were again ready for the sea the debit side of the privateer's account stood charged with the handsome sum of £7151 17s. 5³/₄d. York currency. The schooner was re-christened the "*Langolee*," Captain Black commander, with twenty-two officers and men, and both set sail Monday, September 28, for a trial trip preparatory to their longer cruise. A portion of the log of the "*Langolee*" is preserved which tells us what the daily rations of a privateersman were in the 18th century. Breakfast was at 8 A. M., dinner at noon. Each man was to have six pounds of bread per week, with a half pint of rum per day, his grog to be stopped for wrangling or quarrelling, or for getting drunk; "*Bargow and Butter*" for breakfast, with a pound of beef at dinner on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and on the alternate days rice and butter for breakfast with a pound of pork with pulse for dinner and on Sundays rice and molasses for breakfast with flour and beef for dinner.

On the second day after sailing they succeeded in capturing the American privateer sloop "*Revenge*," Captain Edward Yorke, from Philadelphia, a vessel of thirty-five tons burthen with a crew of thirty officers and men; armed with eight three pound and two pound cannon and eight swivel guns, commissioned, as the condemnation papers recite, "by the persons Stiling themselves the Delegates of the United States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, the three lower Counties on Delaware Maryland Virginia, North Carolina South Carolina, and Georgia, Rebels to our Lord the now King to Cruise against the Vessels and Effects of His Majestys Liege Subjects." The portion of the "*Langolee's*" log which is preserved ends October 9th, when the tender, having become separated from the "*Vengeance*," was being pursued by some larger craft and it would appear that she was captured by the vigilant Yankees, for reference is afterwards made to the exchange of some of her crew including Captain Dean's brother. The "*Vengeance*" however returned to New York, and completed such further preparations as were needful. On November 5, 1779, Captain Dean writes from Sandy Hook: "I have just now returned from on board the Admiral, who gives me Permission to sail without even being examined. The Anchor is just heaving up and we proceed to Sea immediately. . . . If there is any Opportunity of writing to

Bermuda I beg you will not Omit it as 'tis highly probable I will touch there for Water."

Fortune, that fickle dame, did not smile upon the "Vengeance" now as once she did. An unkindly fate that had touched her with a heavy hand when she encountered the "Renown," still followed her on her second cruize. When next the doughty captain wrote, his tone was by no means cheerful.

S^t SIMONS ON BOARD THE VENGEANCE
Dec^r 26th 1779

D^r. Sir

I wrote You from the Hook informing you of my intention of proceeding to Sea immediately which I did with the Loss of my Anchor. I'm sorry to tell you that a Series of hard Luck has attended me ever since—being obliged to quit the Coast off Virginia, where I intended to cruize for some time, by the continual heavy Gales. Dec^r 22^d I arrived at the Island of S^t. Simons to clean and Water—and have had the Misfortune [to] lose my Boat with twelve hands. I hope however they cannot escape, as I mean to pursue them immediately to Savannah—where I suppose they have gone. I will be able to write you more fully from that place. In haste I am D^r Sir

Your most Ob^t. Ser^{ts}

GEORGE DEAN

A fortnight later he wrote as promised.

SAVANNAH, 10th Jan^y 1780.

Dear Sir

I wrote You from S^t. Simons, informing You of my safe Arrival at that place, and my Intention of cleaning and Watering there. It inform'd You likewise of the Loss of My Boat and twelve hands, who found means to give me the Slip on Christmass Night. Three Days after, however, I had the good Fortune to catch them all, on my Way here, Two of the Ring-Leaders I properly secur'd and brought with Me. The rest I left in Irons on board the Snow.

My Expedition to this place has been truly a disagreeable one—having been driven ashore on the Island of S^t. Catharine's, and very narrowly escap'd with My Life, and since my Arrival here, three of my Boat's Crew (Hugh Wyllie, John Neilson and John Harris) on whose Fidelity I thought I cou'd depend, have deserted, and left me in the Lurch. This last Circumstance has distressed me greatly—detaining me so much longer than I expected. Tomorrow, however, I set off for S^t Simons and hope to proceed to Sea immediately on my Arrival there.

As I stood in Need of some Necessaries—I have drawn on You for £40 Stg. in favour of M^r John Tunno, a Copy of the Acco^t. You have enclos'd.

I hope I shall soon have the pleasure of writing You on a more agreeable Subject.

If I shou'd have the good Fortune to take any prizes I shall send them to this Place or to Bermuda, 'till I can have an Opportunity of convoying them to York myself.

A Stephen joins me in wishing to be remember'd to You and M^r.
Richardson.

Believe me to be, with great Esteem

Your most Obed^t Serv^t.

GEORGE DEAN

By the endorsements in the hand of John Porteous it appears that it was April 27, 1780, before either this letter or the one that preceded it reached New York, and this was the last that was ever heard of Captain George Dean or of the privateer, "Vengeance."

July 11, 1780, John Richardson, who had not accompanied the "Vengeance" on her last cruize, wrote to Mr. Porteous from Sandy Hook as he was about leaving on a mercantile venture to Charleston, S. C.: "Yesterday a brig passed from Bermuda which I took to be Morgans, and it gave me the utmost uneasiness. I was from the same reason prevented from getting on board her to see if I could learn anything of Poor Dean. I beg you'll not forget to let me know first opportunity to Charlestown if you have heard of him." On August 22 he wrote from Charleston "Pray have you heard anything of poor Dean? Mr. Tunno's Brother informed me it was his firm intention to cruize a little time off Virginia and if still unsuccessful push for the West Indies, as he was determined to bottomry the Vessel rather than not do something, well knowing that returning without a prize was almost equivalent to a total loss of the Vessel. As this is the case I form hopes that he is yet safe poor fellow."

January 20, 1781, Captain George Knowles, who had been the first lieutenant of the "Vengeance" on her former cruize, now having another command, wrote from Charleston, S. C.: "I am bound for Jamaica and I hoap to learn som Account of the Snow Vengeance." It proved a vain hope, and two years later, in April, 1783, a letter from England to Mr. Porteous written by Trevor Bomford, announcing the death of his brother Thomas Bomford (late captain in the 35th infantry), who had been a shareholder in the "Vengeance" says, "I will esteem it a particular favor if you will acquaint me, particularly about the Snow Vengeance and if She has been heard of."

Whether the ship was lost in some fierce battle with the elements, or was sunk by the guns of her enemies, remained shrouded in mystery and may never be known. With that last word of hopeful expectation from her courageous Captain, her record was closed; the "Vengeance" with her officers and crew disappeared from history and passed forever out of mortal sight and ken.

HENRY R. HOWLAND.

DOCUMENTS

The Papers of Sir Charles Vaughan.

(*First Installment.*)

MOST of those who have studied the social history of England in the nineteenth century as revealed in memoirs and letters are acquainted with the name of Sir Henry Halford, the physician to the King. But in all likelihood only a few think of him as originally bearing the name of Vaughan and belonging to a family of exceptionally wide-spread and varied distinction. One of Sir Henry Halford's brothers was a judge. Another was head of Merton College, Oxford, and after the comfortable fashion of that age of pluralities combined with that post the deanery of Merton. The seventh son of the family, Charles, won a position in his own profession, that of diplomacy, fully as distinguished as that of any of the family. A portion of his career should have a special interest for American readers and with that I propose to deal.

That the two best known members of the family should have won distinction through medicine and diplomacy was but appropriate. At a later day Charles Vaughan labored not a little to trace his pedigree to the fountain-head and to establish a connection with that great Welsh house which claimed the poet Henry Vaughan, the self-styled "Silurist" as a member. No claim of connection could be found and Charles Vaughan had to be contented with tracing the family line back to his great-grandfather who graduated in medicine at Leyden and who married the daughter of Sir Henry Newton, a diplomatist of rare repute. Thus the chief traditions of the family were in those lines, medicine and diplomacy, in which two of the best known members of it afterwards won distinction.

Charles Vaughan was born on December 20, 1774. He was brought up at Rugby School and at Merton College, Oxford, and was in 1798 elected to a fellowship at All Souls' College in that University. That supplemented by the bequest of a small property from one of his mother's kinsmen saved him from being driven by need into any precipitate choice of a profession. His early aspirations were towards his father's calling, medicine, and before becoming a fellow at Oxford he studied medicine for two years at

Edinburgh. There was, however, in Charles Vaughan something, in the better sense of the word, of the adventurer and a good deal of the citizen of the world. The tradition of Welsh descent was as we have seen no more than conjecture. But there was assuredly in Vaughan no small share of the winning and versatile temperament of the Celt. He was neither a profound thinker nor a profound student. But he was acute and observant and such as his mental resources were, natural and acquired, they were all in available small change. Of his own letters no great number are known to be extant. But he was addicted, to a perilous extent, to hoarding the letters of his friends, and what a man receives is hardly less a key to his nature than what he writes. The letters of Vaughan's correspondents plainly show that he had the gift of winning confidence and good-will readily from men of all sorts and conditions. He is constantly doing small kindnesses pleasantly and graciously. His friends look to him for advice in practical difficulties. He is one of those who, without theories of life, see the practical bearings of an emergency and the safe way out of it. He had too the outward graces which are helpful to men in most walks of life and certainly not least in diplomacy. His portraits show us a face of regular and high-bred beauty with an expression full of keenness and purpose, and their evidence is confirmed by those who remember the original.

Vaughan's walk was assuredly that for which above all others his temper and habit of mind fitted him. But the chief impulse from without was given by what we call chance. In 1803 the University of Oxford elected Vaughan to a travelling fellowship, tenable for five years. These years were spent in France, Spain and the Levant, and in adventurous wanderings through western Asia which finally landed Vaughan at St. Petersburg. The resource, the knowledge of and interest in all sorts and conditions of men, thus developed, were an invaluable portion of Vaughan's training as a diplomatist. He kept full and it must be confessed often rather dull journals. Of these some were lost in a shipwreck on the Caspian. But enough survive to show Vaughan's taste for close observation, his keen interest in all the details of the economic life which he saw about him. His temper throughout is the temper of the man of affairs, the shrewd, practical observer, interested in details and not fettered by theories. He has always a keen and observant eye for economical matters. He admires scenery conventionally; he is genuinely interested in crops and manufactures. The every-day comedy of life, the details of incident and character, attract him; he is all the time developing a

natural faculty for dealing promptly and on short acquaintance with a succession of men wholly differing in stations and habits.

In 1806 at St. Petersburg he formed the acquaintance of Charles Stuart, afterwards Lord Stuart de Rothesay. That was in a sense the turning point of Vaughan's life. Two years later Stuart was sent out by the English government to watch British interests in the Spanish peninsula and as opportunity offered to organize resistance to Napoleon. Stuart saw that Vaughan's age, temper and antecedents, especially the knowledge of Spain and of the Spanish language, which he had acquired in his travels, would make him a useful subordinate, and he appointed him as his private secretary. Vaughan's sympathies with the Spanish cause soon found vent in a practical and one may say in some sort a permanent form. In a letter to his sister he says, "I must see the gallant Palafox before my return to England." The design was carried out. Vaughan visited Palafox, was entertained by him for a time and accompanied him as a volunteer in the campaign. This intimacy and a visit to Saragossa itself enabled Vaughan to produce a short account of the siege of that town, which was published in England early in the following year. Vaughan himself states in the preface that his main object in publishing was a practical one, to raise a fund for the relief of the people of Saragossa, distressed by one siege and threatened by another. One can hardly doubt too that Vaughan felt that he was at the same time in a perfectly legitimate way advancing his own interests by establishing a reputation as an authority on Spanish affairs.

In more than one respect Vaughan's Spanish experiences served as a valuable training for his later American duties. One of the problems forced upon his notice during his time of service at Washington was the internal condition of Mexico and also the relation of Spain to her revolted dependencies. In both these matters it was of great service to him to be familiar with Spanish habits of thought and Spanish methods of political action. Throughout Vaughan's career at Washington, his views are marked by what one may call a sane optimism. He over and over again insists on the fact that though American politicians may say unfair and indiscreet things, though American citizens may collectively seem reckless and irresponsible, yet there is always an underlying current of common sense on which we may rely. To distinguish the surface froth from the better elements which underlie it and which really go far to make up national life, this was a lesson which Vaughan had mainly learned from his experience of the Peninsula war.

Once entered on the career of diplomacy Vaughan's progress was at once rapid and sure. We find him returning to England during the course of the war, consulted officially by the Marquis of Wellesley and privately by William Windham. One incident is specially noteworthy. It was Vaughan's melancholy duty to convey to Sir John Moore the news of the Spanish defeat at Tudela, news which told the British general that his own position had become untenable. Of Vaughan's interview with Moore only one recorded incident remains, interesting enough in itself. At a later day Vaughan wrote that Moore had told him it was impossible to defend Portugal without having command of Spain, a view which, as Vaughan points out, was disproved by Wellington at Torres Vedras.

Upon the conclusion of the war and the restoration of Ferdinand, Vaughan remained in office at Madrid as chief secretary to the British embassy. If a full view of the worst and meanest side of royalty be a good training for one who has to deal with a democracy, assuredly Vaughan enjoyed it to the full. During the darkest days of the struggle he had never lost heart and hope. But there must have been moments afterwards when he was tempted to ask

"In God's name then what curse befell us
To fight for such a thing."

Vaughan's papers are full of passages, illustrating the levity, the moral worthlessness and the political incapacity of the King. While the government is ostentatiously carrying on a crusade against houses of ill fame, the person at the head of it is engaged in an intrigue with a girl of low station. Political importance is given to this by the fact that the mother of the royal mistress is trafficking in public offices.

"The leading feature in the character of Ferdinand," Vaughan writes, "is a distrust of every one but particularly of his Ministers and an inclination to deceive them, and it is remarkable that all those who have been suddenly disgraced by him and dismissed and banished from his court have been convinced just previously to their fall that they enjoyed the most unbounded favour and confidence, some unusual mark of familiarity or acquiescence in their opinions having been manifested towards them by the King. To Ferdinand's natural distrust and inclination to deceive is added a temper incapable of forming any attachment or friendship." And this last charge is supported by numerous instances where he betrayed the adherents who had stood by him in poverty and exile. From Madrid Vaughan went in 1820 to the embassy at Paris. Three

years later he was for the first time placed at the head of an embassy, that at Berne, and in 1825 he was appointed to Washington.

The best and simplest way of dealing with Vaughan's career in America will be to consider in succession the various specific questions on which disputes or at least discussions arose and then to touch on his despatches so far as they illustrate important issues on the internal politics of the Republic. These topics include :

(1) Various questions which might arise out of the breaking up of Spanish America into independent republics. (2) Disputes as to the boundary which separated New Brunswick from Maine. (3) Steadily increasing friction as to the reciprocal advantages to be mutually awarded to America and Great Britain in commerce, especially in commerce with the West Indies. (4) That ever recurring bone of contention, the right of search and impressment, complicated and embittered by a cognate question, the suppression of the slave trade.

By a fortunate chance Ward, the British representative in Mexico, had been formerly a colleague of Vaughan in Spain. In 1827 Ward was superseded in consequence of his extravagance and was succeeded by Pakenham, who had served under Vaughan at Berne. Both were of something the same mental stamp, acute, self-reliant and somewhat prejudiced; both were copious letter-writers and thus we get in their correspondence with Vaughan pictures of Mexican politics and of the relations of Mexico towards Great Britain and the United States, often no doubt prejudiced, but always vigorous and original. Each regarded with intense suspicion the American minister, Poinsett. There is a touch of irony in the fact that when all memory of his supposed Machiavellianism has faded away, Poinsett should be enjoying such immortality as the name of a flower can bestow on its discoverer.

According to Ward, Poinsett was in everything aiming shrewdly and somewhat unscrupulously at building up American influence in Mexico; he induced Mexico to consent to the doctrine that free bottoms make free goods; but he did so by a concession, embodied in a secret article, to the effect that during the war between Spain and Mexico all American vessels carrying Spanish goods, west of San Antonio and fairly within the Gulf of Mexico should be lawful prize. He was also purposely leaving the question of boundary in a state of ambiguity so as to give opening for future aggression.

The chief difficulty in the relations between Mexico and the United States, the struggle for Texas, is as yet no more than an undefined cloud on the horizon, but it is there. As early as 1826 Ward in a letter to Vaughan, to which I have already referred, dis-

cusses the American designs on Texas. The boundary will be left undecided. There will be a gradual influx of American settlers. Already Poinsett has been trying to float a land company for Texas in New York and promising the support of the government. The territory will have become American *de facto* before the question of right is fairly settled. There is also among Vaughan's papers a remarkable memorandum dated Mexico, Feb. 18, 1830, and headed secret. It does not read like the writing of Pakenham and is more probably a translation of some document written by a Mexican and addressed either to Pakenham or Vaughan. It sets forth the case very clearly from a strongly anti-American point of view. It opens by declaring that "the History of the United States is one of steady and continuous encroachment, not with the noisy pomp of conquest, but with silence, perseverance and uniformity." Mexican influence in Texas is to be gradually undermined by a steady in-pouring of squatters from the United States. Already the law of emancipation passed by the Mexican government has been set at defiance. Yet in a later paragraph the writer qualifies this by admitting that the law as applied to Texas has been modified, owing to the difficulty of enforcement. The writer goes on to point out the special value of Texas as a province of Mexico for agricultural purposes, for the production of ship timber and for internal navigation. Such a province close at hand, enjoying the advantages of slave labor, will be a formidable rival to the really Spanish portion of Mexico. Yet the writer's remedial proposals are utterly futile. The coasting trade between Texas and the rest of Mexico is to be developed. Texas itself is to be used as a settlement for convicts, and so garrisoned against encroachments. It would be difficult to imagine a scheme more certain to bring about the very result dreaded. We see from Pakenham's reports that the ultimate annexation of Texas must not be looked on as an isolated act, but as the culmination of a train of events, of which, when once started, the conclusion was well-nigh inevitable.

Another source of anxiety to Vaughan and his correspondents is the likelihood of Mexico in conjunction with one of the other Spanish-American republics attempting to seize Cuba. Fortunately the danger is lessened by a cumbrous provision in the Mexican constitution which, while it left the President free to employ the navy as he pleased, made the concurrence of the House of Deputies necessary for any land operations. Clay was the American foreign secretary and he and Vaughan were fully agreed as to the necessity for checking any such attempt. It might, Clay sees, entangle America in difficulties with the powers of the Old World and it

might bring about a servile insurrection, a prospect which at once filled the South with the dread of "*proximus ardet*." Clay hopes that some good may come from Russian intervention. Vaughan has little hope in that quarter. He is more inclined to rely on the fact that the Spanish Government has "most unaccountably contrived to put Havannah in a respectable state of defence"—a sarcasm clearly based on recollection of the Peninsula war.

The danger of the United States's being dragged in is increased by the fact that Porter, the commander of the Mexican fleet, was an ex-officer in the United States navy. Poinsett too is, one may say of course, suspected of giving underhand encouragement to these schemes which his government disavows. Yet strange to say Vaughan mentions a report current at Washington, that certain Spaniards in Cuba were plotting a counter-revolution in Mexico and that Poinsett was abetting them. It would seem as if Poinsett was one of those unhappy men who through some defect of manner and character, contrive to excite suspicion and to have a reputation for duplicity far in excess of their real deserts. It is clear too that the Mexican government was trying to play off the two powers, England and America one against the other. Poinsett's successor, Butler, apparently an upright and truthful man, told Pakenham that he had been assured by the Mexican government that in any quarrel with America, Mexico would have the support of England.

Mexico is not the only one of the newly created Spanish-speaking republics of which we learn something from these papers. There is among them a despatch from Colonel Campbell, the English representative in Colombia, drawing a melancholy picture of that country, honeycombed with intrigues and only redeemed by the honesty and public spirit of Bolivar. One passage in a letter of Campbell's is interesting as showing how among thoughtful Americans something of a reaction was setting in from the buoyant self-confidence of Jefferson and his school. In April, 1829, Campbell writes to Vaughan: "General Harrison [the American minister in Colombia] declared in a large company in my presence that Federation would be the ruin of any of the new States and that even in the United States they found the greatest difficulty in making the system work from the almost impossibility of distinguishing between the powers of the individual state and the Union." There are alarming rumours too of repudiation. But this will probably be checked, Campbell thinks, by the respect which was felt in Colombia for the public opinion of Europe.

The following letters reproduced as they appear in the Vaughan papers¹ throw light on the question of the interoceanic canal, and on other problems growing out of the South American conditions as well as on other diplomatic questions of the time.

JOHN A. DOYLE.

I. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 2. October 1826.

Mr. Canning,

Sir, Mr. Palmer of New York, who calls himself the "general Agent² of the Central American and United States Atlantic and Pacific Canal Company,"³ has lately been at Washington, and I have the honor to inclose an article, which has appeared in the newspapers, purporting to give an abstract of the terms and conditions of the contract lately entered into by a company at New York and the Republic of Guatemala.

By the inclosed article it appears, that the canal across the isthmus of Panama by the lake of Nicaragua, is to be navigable for ships; that the Republic of Guatemala is bound to permit the cutting of timber for the works—to furnish plans and charts, to procure workmen, and to indemnify the owners of lands—The accounts of the Company are to be audited every six months by the Republic, and interest at the rate of 10 per cent, to be allowed upon the sums expended.

The company is to receive two thirds of the amount of duties and after the payments by the Republic of the capital vested in the canal, the Company is to be entitled for seven years, to receive one half of the nett proceeds, and to have the exclusive privilege of navigating the canal with steam boats for 20 years, free of duties, the Company to fix the amount to be paid for freight on board steam-boats, and for towing vessels through the canal.

Thus the navigation of the Canal will be completely in the hands of the Company formed in the United States, though the Contract provides that the navigation shall be common to all friendly and neutral nations, without any exclusive privilege.

¹ At the death of Sir Charles Vaughan his papers passed into the possession of his nephew, the second Sir Henry Hallford, and passed from him to his son the third baronet, upon whose death they were transferred to All Souls' College, Oxford. They were left with the understanding that Mr. Doyle was to have custody and use of them. The collection is a miscellaneous one, a great mass of private correspondence, memoranda of all sorts, pamphlets, newspaper extracts, and copies of diplomatic correspondence, as well as full journals of Vaughan's travels. Most of the letters printed above are themselves copies probably made by one of Vaughan's staff.—ED.

² See Niles's *Register*, Vol. 31, pp. 2, 3, 72, 73.—ED.

³ The directors of the Company were DeWitt Clinton, Stephen Van Rensselaer, Morris Robinson, Edward Livingston, Charles J. Catlett. Full accounts will be found in *House Reports* Thirtieth Congress, Second Session, No. 145, especially pp. 362-375.—ED.

It is said that the estimate of the expence to be borne by the Company, does not exceed half a million of Dollars, and that the subscription has been filled up at New York.

As this Canal is to pass by the river San Juan and the lake Nicaragua it is supposed that the excavation will not exceed seventeen miles.

II. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 20. Octr. 1826.

Mr. Canning,

Sir, I have already taken notice to you of a company at New York, which have obtained a contract from the Govt. of Guatemala for making a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama by the lake Nicaragua. Having observed, that the Agent of the Company was at Washington, about the time of Mr. Clay's return, I took an opportunity of asking him what countenance this Govt. was likely to give to that scheme.

Mr. Clay informed me that the agent of that Company had been indefatigable in his endeavours to engage through himself and other ministers, the Government of the United States to take part in this contract, but that it was resolved that the Govt. should have nothing to do with it in any shape.

If the Canal was to be made by any foreign power he should not regret that it fell to the lot of Americans to effect it, but that he was convinced that it must be carried into effect with the consent of all nations, studiously avoiding any privileges reserved for any one.

I could not collect from Mr. Clay, that his Govt. entertained a better opinion of the capability of the company to effect the enterprize which they have undertaken than which may be collected from public report.

III. VAUGHAN TO CANNING.

WASHINGTON. 30. Sepr. 1825.

Sir, the American Minister of State, Mr. Clay, has informed me, that he has received from Mr. Rufus King, a report of an interview which the latter has had with you, in which he tells me that a coincidence of opinion, and a frank unreserved expression of your sentiments had prevailed in a manner to render that report most interesting and satisfactory.

Mr. Clay went on to tell me, that after the last battle which took place in Spanish America, and which seemed to have completely destroyed the Royalist army, the United States had conceived that it would be worth while to endeavour to get the influence of Russia to bear upon the Court of Spain, in order to bring about a peace between the latter and its late American Provinces. Mr. Clay then read to me a note, in which the Govt. of the United States recapitulated to the Emperor of Russia the leading features attending the separation of the Spanish American Colonies, the importance of preserving to Spain the Islands of Cuba and

Porto Rico and pressed upon the consideration of the Emperor many other points which it is unnecessary for me to attempt to recapitulate as I understand that a copy of this representation has been laid before you.¹ I observed that it was dated the 10th. of May 1825 and I understand that no answer had yet been received to it.

Mr. Clay afterwards put into my hands, a letter which he had received from Mr. Rufus King (a copy of which I have the honor to inclose), in which he transmitted to Mr. Clay a copy of a letter which you had addressed to him dated Wortley Hall August 7th.

Having been made acquainted with these papers, I was naturally anxious to collect what impression had been made by the proposition contained in your letter to Mr. King. Mr. Clay observed to me, that it was his conviction, that Spain was to be acted upon only through her fears, or her interests, and that when Spain once felt secure about Cuba, by the combined declaration of other powers, that she would then more obstinately persist in refusing peace to her American Provinces.

Mr. Clay however seemed very sensible of the importance of any measure that should bind *France*² within the same line of Policy and forbearance with regard to Cuba which was laid down by Gt. Britain and the United States, and he read to me part of letter from the American Minister at Madrid, dated in July last, from whence I inferred, that jealousy had been entertained here of the projects of France with regard to Cuba, as the letter stated, that the most positive assurances had just been given him that the King of Spain had never had the intention for a moment of ceding either Cuba or Porto Rico to France or to any other power.

Mr. Clay observed to me that if France continued to send large Squadrons of ships of war into the West Indian Seas she must expect that in future other States would require an explanation of their objects. That the occupation of Cuba by a French force would be just grounds of war on the part of the United States. He expressed to me his conviction that sooner or later the Island of Cuba would become independent of Spain—That its continued dependence on Spain, as at present, was in his opinion, was the most desirable thing that could happen, it being impossible to consent to its falling into the hands of any maritime State. But its independence might require the guarantee of those States, or it might be annexed to the Republic of Colombia or of Mexico. His views upon this subject as detailed to me, coincided with those which he had formerly stated to Mr. Addington and which that gentleman reported to you in his Dispatch marked separate of the 21st. May 1825.

¹ See *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VI. 544; VII. 8-10, 15, 88.—ED.

² This is brought out clearly as the policy of the government in Adams's conference with the Russian minister, *Memoirs*, VII. 10. On August 21, some five weeks before the date of the letter above given, Poinsett had written Clay concerning a rumored attack by a French fleet upon Cuba and Mexico. The English and American ministers acted together on the matter and the Mexican government, with the approval of our minister, referred in its notes to the principle of the Monroe doctrine. *Am. St. Papers, For. Rel.*, V. 909.—ED.

Mr. Poinsett the Minister from the United States at Mexico, has given information that the agents from the disaffected at Cuba are very busy in that City, in persuading the Govt. to fit out an expedition for the purpose of effecting their independence and Mr. Clay believes that the Republic of Colombia is disposed to act in concert with that of Mexico.¹ It was evident that Mr. Clay considered the dependence of Cuba upon those Republics, as preferable only to the intervention of any European Power, that of the United States being impossible.

Though I did not feel myself called upon to give any opinion upon the proposed plans with which I had become acquainted, by the papers which he had allowed me to read, I could not help expressing my satisfaction upon finding that some means had been devised, which might possibly end in calming all our uneasiness, about the intervention of the French on the one hand in the valuable Islands belonging to Spain, and on the other from the doubtful chance of any satisfactory settlement of their independence of the new Republics of Mexico and Colombia. I ventured to observe also that if a suspension of arms could only be obtained from the projected representation to the Spanish Govt., it would have the best effect upon the interior of the Spanish American Provinces and that it would contribute to check the piratical adventures upon those coasts, which had given our respective Govts. so much trouble.

I am sorry that I cannot after all that passed between myself and Mr. Clay, form any distinct notion of what will probably be his instructions to Mr. King respecting the proposal for a combined representation to the Spanish Govt., and I was disposed to believe that the recent departure of the President from Washington, on a visit to his Father, and which is to occupy him a month had probably prevented due discussion of this subject previously to his departure, but I observed Mr. King's letter was marked as received on the 15th. Sepr., and the President did not set out until the 21st. inst.

I have every reason to be satisfied with the unreserved manner in which Mr. Clay has communicated with me on this and other occasions, and using all due discretion and reserve with regard to the information which has been imparted to me, I shall take care to communicate to you whatever may transpire, about the decision of the Govt.

IV. VAUGHAN TO WARD.

WASHINGTON. Feb. 13, 1826.

I began my mission to the United States, under a conviction, that the British Govt. attached great importance to its relations with this country. A spirit of conciliation pervaded both Govts., altho' certain points of collision, such as the boundary line, the commercial intercourse with British Colonies and the indemnification for slaves under the St. Petersburg convention still subsisted, they were in the course of arrangement by commissioners and negotiations in London. It seemed therefore,

¹ See *Adams's Memoirs*, VII. 16.—E.D.

that a very important part of my functions here, in order to facilitate the adjustment of differences which were in negotiation, was to conciliate the good humour, and cultivate the good feelings, which both Govts. were ready to assure me existed between them.

Now, I regret, that a jealousy should have been excited at Mexico, by Mr. Poinsett's conduct, which is at variance with the tenor of the declarations repeatedly made to me by this Govt., that the United States seek no exclusive privileges in Spanish America. That they will follow implicitly the open and avowed conduct of Gt. Britain in that respect.

You will perhaps say, that this may be their policy, in their commercial relations, but that they are seeking to make a general Federation of America, which is to exclude, in every possible shape, European connections, and that the United States seek to be placed at the head of that Federation, for the purpose of directing its operations and feelings, and that thereby in any future rupture between us, and the United States, a power is to be thrown into the scale of our enemy.

I confess that I look upon the new States of America, as of value, only, to the rest of the world, on account of the commerce to be carried on with them, and that I am not under the slightest apprehension of England being thrown overboard by Mexico, and the other States, or even by the United States, so long as raw produce must be exchanged for manufactures, so long as the New States require assistance in their great financial difficulties, and so long as they are so perfectly inadequate to their own defence against the enterprizes of European Powers, without the maritime friendship of England.

I confess that I do not fear that influence which the United States may seek to obtain, by placing themselves at the head of an American Confederation—I count upon the prejudices, the repugnance of all Spaniards to listen to strangers, upon their fanaticism, as safeguards against any overbearing influence of the United States until I find that they have entered into stipulations positively injurious to European Powers.

With regard to the encroachments in Texas, I learn from the Mexican Mission at Washington, that settlements from the United States were established in that Country at the solicitation of the Mexican Govt. It was lately stated in Congress here, that the Province of Texas had given away as much land as is contained in the United States territory of Arkansas, and that by those gifts a multitude of useful citizens had been enticed from this country. It was stated that more than 20,000 persons have left the Western States of this Govt. for the Province of Texas. It does not seem however that they amalgamated well with the old Spanish settlers, as it is their custom, whenever crime is to be punished, or disputes to be settled, to send for a judge to the neighbouring State of this Union.

The encroachments in Texas have arisen therefore rather from the imprudence of the Mexicans than the intrigues of Mr. Poinsett. There must always exist between the United States and Gt. Britain a certain rivalry in commerce and navigation, but I have been lately under a con-

viction, that our interests are compatible with each other, and inclined to contribute all in my power, to the extinguishing of our old animosities, and to the jointly profiting by the new commercial relations opened to us, by the independence of the Southern half of America.

It will be long before the New States can tempt us into a closer Political connection, than that arising out of commerce. Our connection with the United States is of a different character, and I should regret the possibility of your being obliged to act in opposition to Mr. Poinsett in Mexico, in a manner that should induce an impression at Washington that we are jealous of them in the New States. In my anxiety however to cement the Union between Gt. Britain and the United States, I should be anxious, in no shape to relax your vigilance in watching the conduct of the Agents of the latter at Mexico.

I am very anxious to know the nature of the Treaty which Morier and yourself negotiated with the Americans, and also the nature of the Treaty¹ made by Mr. Poinsett, and which the Mexicans have lately rejected. The newspapers at Washington have told us, that one Article in the British Treaty conceded the point of Neutral flags, making neutral goods. The United States will be delighted at such a concession,² (which we have hitherto refused at so much loss of life and treasure), as I find that in discussions recently in Congress, it has been thrown out, as an argument for assisting at Panama, that that question might there be agitated, and the best effect might be produced by the New States of America insisting upon that condition in their treaties with other Powers.

I do not know how to reconcile the supposed anxiety of the United States to form a general Federation of America, with themselves at the head of it, with the backwardness and the opposition which has been manifested by both Houses of Congress, to accept the invitation to assist at the Congress at Panama. Colombia, Mexico and Guatemala invited the United States to send Representatives to Panama—The President accepted the invitation and named Messrs. Anderson and Sergeant to go there—That appointment requires the confirmation of the Senate, and immediately after the meeting of Congress, they were called upon to ratify the appointment. Up to this day they have not decided whether they will approve of the appointment or not. In the meantime the House of Representatives, have discussed the question upon the pretext of asking for papers respecting the invitation, and the result has been, a strong manifestation of dislike to the United States entering into what they call *entangling alliances*.

¹ Full particulars in *American State Papers, For. Rel.* folio edition, Vol. VI., pp. 578 ff. Poinsett was instructed to secure a treaty of limits and also a treaty of amity and commerce. The former treaty was made and adopted; the latter was not finally ratified by both parties.—ED.

² "That free ships shall also give freedom to goods" was stipulated by Art. 16 of the Poinsett treaty which was finally not adopted. The same stipulation appears in the treaty of 1831, Article XV., 1, and in almost the same words. The treaty of 1831 was obtained by Butler, Poinsett's successor, but he seems to have profited by Poinsett's labors.—ED.

Pardon me, my dear Ward, for writing you so long, so tiresome a letter, but you seemed to wish to have my opinion upon some points, and I am very anxious to encourage you to communicate with me in the very satisfactory and interesting manner, in which you have done lately—
etc. etc. etc. (Signed) CHAS. R. VAUGHAN.

V. VAUGHAN TO WARD.

WASHINGTON. 28. March 1826.

My dear Ward,

Since I last wrote to you I have been told by Mr. Obregon the Mexican Minister to the United States, that Morier has returned to Mexico, but I do not yet hear whether our Govt. has consented to rectify [ratify?] the commercial treaty which you conjointly made.

Some light has been thrown upon that Treaty during the discussion in the Congress of the United States, respecting the expediency of this Govt. accepting the invitation made to it by Colombia, Mexico and Guatemala to assist by Representatives at the Congress about to be held at Panama. I send you two newspapers which contain the correspondence between Mr. Clay and Mr. Poinsett, upon the subject of the latter having decided to reject any article in the Treaty between the United States and Mexico, of a nature similar to one said to have been inserted in the British Treaty with Mexico, granting the concession to the New States of special commercial privileges. You will see in the letter of Mr. Clay to Mr. Poinsett that this Govt. approves of the conduct of the latter.

These papers however have brought on a discussion in Congress, upon the subject of the pledge which Mr. Poinsett has undertaken to assert to the Mexican negociators, that the United States have given to bear the brunt of any contest which may arise out of the interference of any European Power in the independence or Government of the New States.¹ The House of Representatives disavows this pledge and declares that it knows of no other foundation for it, than a passage in the Message to Congress of Mr. Monroe Decr. 1823. In that message Mr. Monroe observed that any interposition by any European Power, for the purpose of oppressing or controlling the destiny of the States, whose in-

¹ Poinsett was instructed to repeat to Mexico the substance of the Monroe Doctrine. In a letter to Poinsett dated November 9, 1825, Clay said: "But when an attack is imagined to be menaced by Europe upon the independence of the United Mexican States, then an appeal is made to those fraternal sympathies which are justly supposed to belong to our condition as a member of the American family. No longer than about three months ago, when an invasion by France of the island of Cuba was believed at Mexico, the United Mexican Government promptly called upon the Government of the United States, through you, to fulfil the memorable pledge of the President of the United States in his message to Congress of December, 1823. What they would have done had the contingency happened, may be inferred from a dispatch to the American minister at Paris, a copy of which is herewith sent, which you are authorized to read to the plenipotentiaries of the United Mexican States." (*American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, Vol. VI., p. 583.)—ED.

dependence of Spain the United States had acknowledged could not be viewed in any other light than as ~~the manifestation of an unfriendly~~ disposition towards the United States."

There is a wide difference as you will perceive, between the pledge asserted by Mr. Poinsett to have been given and the expression of the Ex-President Monroe. The Congress has required from the President, information, to know whether the executive Govt. has subsequently given instructions to Mr. Poinsett to hold out that the United States have given the pledge which he puts forward as an argument to induce the Mexicans to close with his terms for a commercial treaty. It is not doubted but that Mr. Poinsett has no other authority for his assertion than the message of President Monroe, which, I remember, made a strong impression in Europe couched even in his moderate language.

I think it right to put you in possession of what may be collected of the policy of this country with regard to Mexico and with the new States in general, by adding a newspaper copy of the instructions of Mr. Adams (now President) to Mr. Anderson when he was sent to Colombia.

The mission to Panama has met with considerable opposition in the Congress. The President accepted the invitation from Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia, but his nomination of Mr. Anderson (at present Minister to Colombia), and of Mr. Serjeant a Lawyer of Philadelphia, required the confirmation of the Senate. In that body a personal opposition to Mr. Adams exists, which has grown out of the past Presidential election. Much time has been lost in taking the subject into consideration—and great delay in bringing it to a decision. At length about the 15th. of March, the Senate decided to confirm the nominations made by the President by a majority of 24 to 19.

In the House of Representatives the subject is still under discussion, as they are required to make an appropriation for the expence of the mission. I am assured by Mr. Clay that the measure will certainly pass this House.

From the moment of the meeting of Congress in Decr. this question has been in agitation. The Plenipotentiaries cannot yet depart for Panama until the House of Representatives have voted the supply and they will not debate the question before Monday 3rd. of April. A dislike of meddling with the Congress at Panama at all, has been manifested in a considerable degree, and all this delay does not indicate the eagerness of the Nation in general to take their station, as the directing head of the new Republics, according to the principles of Mr. Poinsett.

We must not however allow ourselves to be lulled into a negligent observance of the conduct of the United States by their repeated declarations of equality and reciprocity in commercial regulations and their abhorrence of entering into alliances, which may "entangle and compromise" them—But at the same time I would inculcate great vigilance respecting their political movements in the new States, I apprehend that it is of great importance, not to risk the growing good-will between our respective Govts. by any exposure of jealousy on our part, of the attempts

of the Agents from the United States, to obtain the ascendancy at which they seem to aspire.

Depend upon it, that it will be but a fruitless effort on the part of these people to win the affections of so bigotted, so prejudiced, so ignorant a people as the descendants from Spain in America and that too, in opposition to all that they must owe to England for protection, for interchange of manufactures, for the produce of her mines which England alone can enable her to procure, let alone the impression of her power which the last contest in Spain against France must have left upon the new States.

With regard to your colleague Mr. Poinsett I must tell you that he enjoys a great reputation among the politicians of Washington and that there is very little disposition to doubt about his judgment.

I wrote you, not long since by New York, but I do not know whether a conveyance was found there for my letters. We are without news from England later than the 20 Janry. Many packets are due. The last intelligence received at New York, stated that Dawkins had been appointed to go to Panama. I am anxious to hear from him upon the subject. I think it is well that somebody should be sent to keep our Govt. acquainted with what is going on. We are told that the Deputies from Peru, Chili, Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia are already assembled. The Commissioners from the United States will arrive in time, it is said, because the business will be confined at first to the Belligerents.

VI. WARD TO CANNING.

MEXICO. 7 April 1826.

The Right Honle. George Canning,
Sir,

It is with unfeigned satisfaction that I am, at length enabled to inform you that M Camacho's mission to England has been sanctioned in the Senate by a majority of 23 to 4.

The question was not brought on till this morning, and the decision was communicated to me almost at the same moment by a message from the Senate, and by an Aide de Camp of the President.

After the apprehensions expressed both by Mr. Morier and myself, with regard to the result of the discussion, you will probably be surprised at the manner in which it has terminated: But in a country where public opinion is not founded on any fixed principles and where the ignorance and suspicions of the leading men expose them to the attacks of those whose interest it often is to turn this want of fixed principles to account, you must not wonder at any fluctuations, however sudden, or however great the contradiction to which they must lead.

In the present instance I am bound to state my conviction that the Senate was *surprised* into the decision respecting the mission of M. Gomez Pedraza, without being at all aware of the consequences, with which that decision might have been attended.

The Government, from a foolish confidence in its own influence, took no steps to explain the real nature of the question, or to clear away that obscurity in which Mr. Poinsett had contrived to involve it; nor was it until General Victoria was roused into action by the disgrace of one failure, and the apprehension of a second, that any efforts were made on the part of the executive to carry a point of such vital importance to the Country.

It would be doing the President great injustice however, were I to refrain from stating, that, from the period of my conversation with him (of which I had the honor of giving you an account in my Dispatch No 22) up to the present moment his exertions have been as indefatigable as his inactivity in the first instance, was imprudent. To my knowledge, he has even gone so far as to declare, not to one but several Senators, that he would no longer remain at the head of affairs, if, upon such an occasion the honour, and plighted faith of the Government were to be again wantonly sacrificed.

I shall not attempt to explain, sir, the anomaly of such energetic language being held at one time, and such unaccountable apathy displayed at another. It is one of those contradictions peculiar to this country, which one must take advantage of, but which it is impossible to account for. Certain it is, however, that upon the present occasion it is to this change of conduct on the part of the President that we must attribute in a great measure the sort of revulsion which has taken place, in the feelings of the Senate with regard to Mr. Camacho.

I must confess likewise the utility of that delay which, in the first instance, I was inclined to regard as disadvantageous. By putting off the discussion time has been allowed for giving a wider circulation to those opinions which it was absolutely necessary to disseminate, and I have little doubt at present, that had the question been brought on a week ago, altho' it might have been carried, the result would not have been nearly so satisfactory.

Genl. Victoria has been seconded by men of all Parties: The arrival of Genl. Bravo¹ in the Capital, which took place about ten days ago, secured the co-operation of all his friends; all those who regard a connection with England as essential to the interests of this Country of course, sided with Government, and latterly, many, even of Mr. Poinsett's adherents, finding that there would certainly be a majority against them, endeavoured to make a merit with the President by offering him their votes.

Amongst them Mr. Zavala's name must not be omitted who, with that delightful inconsistency which I have so often had occasion to remark upon here, after doing everything in his power out of the Senate to get M Camacho's appointment thrown out, finished by speaking and voting

¹ Nicolás Bravo, a Mexican general of distinction. Chosen Vice-President in 1824. In 1828 he was at the head of a rebellion against the government demanding the acceptance of the plan of Montaño. He was unsuccessful. He was president for a short time in 1846.—ED.

for him in the House. With General Bravo's frank and manly behaviour I have been much pleased; when I first spoke to him upon the subject of M. Camacho, soon after his return to the Capital, he told me fairly that he could not perceive what interest England could have in insisting upon the appointment of a Minister when there was evidently *so* strong an objection on the part of the Senate to allow any one holding a responsible official situation to leave the country. I explained in reply the misapprehension under which he laboured, and had no sooner convinced him, by shewing him the official correspondence (which, strange as it may appear, had not been communicated to him by the President), that our only anxiety was to enable the Government to redeem a pledge, which had been *voluntarily* given and not sought—much less insisted upon—by Gt. Britain, then he assured me that I might depend upon him, and upon the vote of every individual over whom he had the least influence; and such the event has proved to be the case.

With regard to the Senate, I must repeat, that it was *surprised* into its former decision.

I have naturally been thrown into very close communication with several members of that body during the last fortnight, and I have found them certainly labouring under a false impression, but by no means unwilling to allow that impression to be removed. Many were strongly prepossessed against M. Camacho's mission, not because they did not attach sufficient importance to the object of it, nor from any indifference as to the results, but simply because they had been taught to believe, by the American party, that M. Camacho was *not* the man to whom such a mission ought to be confided.

It required no little time or patience to convince men, thus schooled betimes, that they had been most grossly imposed upon, and that the persons who had shewn so much activity in endeavouring to mislead them were perfectly aware that unless M. Camacho were intrusted with the negotiation, its failure would be inevitable. In effecting this, the letter which I had the honor of enclosing in my Dispatch No. 22 and of which several copies were put into circulation, was of some use; and though the language used in that letter, was certainly strong, I can hardly regret the circumstance which rendered that language necessary, for I am inclined to believe, that the lesson which the Senate has now received will be of use hereafter, by putting many well meaning men upon their guard against the designs of a party which, in the present instance had so nearly succeeded in involving them in a fatal contest with His M's Government.

For the line which I have myself taken in this discussion I shall make no apologies: Convinced that exertions were imperiously called for on our part when foreign influence was so openly exerted against us, and trusting that you would not disapprove of an interference, however direct, the object of which was, *not to influence the decision of a question purely Mexican*, but to neutralize the hostility of the party opposed to us, and thus to afford the Government and well-disposed portion of the Chambers of Mexico an opportunity of giving His M's. Government a

proof of their real sentiments ; I have steadily adhered to the course which, in my Dispatch marked separate, and dated 18th. March, I stated it to be my intention to pursue. I have indeed, been forced to assume a higher tone than I then thought necessary but His M's. Commissioners by keeping in the background during the first discussion, had given their opponents an advantage which nothing but very decided measures could have deprived them of : I did not therefore scruple to run the risk even of widening the breach in the event of a second failure, in order to convince the Mexicans of the extreme importance of the point which they were about to discuss ; and I threatened them with a positive rupture with Gt. Britain, as the best means of preventing that rupture from taking place. I am willing to confess however, that nothing but the success with which it has been attended, could warrant the expedient to which I resorted, and it is to your indulgence that I must look for my justification.

It now only remains for me to add that M. Comacho's health is completely restored and that he will take the very first opportunity which presents itself of proceeding to England.

It would be presumption in me to express even a wish with regard to the reception which His M's. Government may think proper to give to the proposals of which he is the bearer ; but after the very signal defeat which the American party has sustained upon the present occasion, I should indeed be grieved if M. Camacho's mission were to terminate in a manner which would inevitably throw the game here once more into the hands of the United States.

I have the honor to be etc. etc. (signed) H. G. WARD.

VII. WARD TO VAUGHAN.

MEXICO. 23 May. 1826.

My dear Vaughan,

I am very glad to have so early an opportunity of acknowledging your very interesting letter of the 28th. March.

The Packet by New York has not reached me, which I regret the more as I do not perceive by that now before me that you have received the copies of my correspondence with the Foreign Office, and other letters which I sent you as far back as the 28th. of last November, and which I should be sorry to think were lost.

It is true that you discuss the same subjects as those to which these letters alluded ; but still they may have been brought before you merely by the publication of Mr. Poinsett's correspondence.

Under this impression I send you a duplicate copy of a Dispatch, which will give you a sufficient insight into the nature of the contest which I have had to sustain with Mr. Poinsett here. He has fought a hard battle, and is, as you justly describe him, a man of great talent, and, in every respect, a most formidable antagonist. Fortunately the United States have many vulnerable points. They have thwarted the

views of the Government with regard to the Island of Cuba, and the strong language of the President on this subject is not at all liked.

They have offended Mexican vanity by putting in a claim to be considered as the heads of the great American Federation.

In the North, they are bad neighbors, and have excited serious apprehensions with regard to Texas, by their systematic encroachments.

All these motives of dissatisfaction on the part of Mexico have been in my favour, and I do not hesitate to confess that without them I must have quitted the field.

With the best wishes to preserve that good understanding between our two Governments which you justly deem so important, I have been unable at times, to keep on very friendly terms with Mr. Poinsett. This was more particularly the case just after Morier's departure, when the question respecting Mr. Camacho's mission to England was still pending, and when we were almost involved in a personal quarrel. Since that great point was decided, things have gone on more smoothly, and we are now on very good terms.

I do not think that there is any immediate prospect of Mr. Poinsett's bringing his negotiation to a conclusion: Mr. Camacho who is a firm, and thoroughly honourable man, refuses, and I think with much reason, to sign a commercial Treaty, without coming to some explicit understanding respecting Boundaries, and insists upon an official Declaration, adopting the line fixed by the Treaty of lines and referring to a commission the correct geographical definition of that line.

Mr. Poinsett wishes to keep the whole question open, to make it a subject of a separate negotiation, and thus to afford time to the emigrants from the United States, who have already overrun a great part of Texas, to establish themselves there so firmly, that it will be impossible to expel them; in which case he probably hopes that a cession of right may be easily obtained.

Upon this point the Governments are at issue: Mr. Poinsett is procrastinating in the hope that when Mr. Camacho goes to England, he may succeed better with some other negotiator.

In this hope he will be disappointed; for the President has given a solemn promise to Mr. Camacho, that nothing shall be done during his absence, and that no Treaty shall be signed without him. I, therefore, feel but little apprehension with regard to the result, and have likewise the satisfaction of knowing, that, so far from obtaining any privilege or advantage over us Mr. Poinsett is forced to yield many of the points which we have virtually carried, trusting to the stipulation that the United States shall be regarded as the most favoured nation, for the attainment hereafter, of those concessions which he cannot now obtain.

Mr. Camacho's health is quite restored, and he is now only waiting for a proper conveyance which I am daily in expectation of being able to obtain for him.

A French general commercial agent (Mr. Martin) has recently arrived here: he met with anything but a favourable reception at first, and

it required no little labour to convince General Victoria, that even although his credentials were exceptionable, it would, at all events, be highly advantageous to Mexico to allow a man of respectability to reside here, in order to counteract those reports, which Spain so assiduously circulates with regard to the state of affairs in these countries. Intrigues could not long be carried on without being detected, and when detected might easily be cut short.

Mr. Martin appears to me a sensible and intelligent man, and nothing can be fairer than his professions: If he acts up to them he may be sure of my warmest support in every thing; for to induce the other powers of Europe to follow the example of Gt. Britain, is, I know, Mr. Canning's object, as it will be the best proof of the merits of his enlightened policy.

The United States need be under no apprehension with regard to the arrival of their Plenipotentiaries at Panama in time: The Mexican Plenies. M. M. Michelena and Dominguez have only just left Acapulco: They were to have sailed on board the *Asia*, but most fortunately for them, a plan was discovered on the part of the crew, to make amends for their treachery last year, by carrying the vessel into some Spanish port, where they thought that such a peace-offering as the Plenies. to Panama, would ensure them not only pardon, but rewards.

A law has just passed here abolishing all privileges and distinctions of Nobility.

Another, (of some importance) making it high treason to *propose* treating with Spain on any terms, but the unqualified recognition of the Independence, under the present form of Government, and subjecting to eight years imprisonment, any individual (whatever be his situation) who shall, either publicly or privately, bring forward a proposition on the part of the Spanish Government, or *any other in its name*, to grant to the Mother Country any species of indemnity, or compensation for the loss of her ancient supremacy—This will put an end to any idea of mediation on the part of Great Britain, tho' I had seen too much of the obstinacy of H. C. M. ever to think that Mr. Lamb's efforts on this subject would be of any avail.

I have now, I believe, told you all that has passed here of late: I shall therefore, conclude by hoping soon to hear from you again, and by assuring you that I shall ever remain,

My dear Vaughan,
Most Sincerely yours

H. G. WARD.

VIII. WARD TO VAUGHAN.

MEXICO. 10th. June 1826.

My dear Vaughan,

I have at last the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 13th. Feby., which has arrived from New York, just in time to enable me to thank you for it by the Courier whom I am about to dispatch this afternoon.

I need not tell you that I am most sincerely grateful to you for your advice, and honest opinion, nor will, I conceal from you the fact, that, had we been in communication sooner, and I had been assured by a person so well able to ascertain the truth, that Mr. Poinsett, in his plans here was not acting in concert with either the Govt. or the Congress at home, my opposition to him would have been conducted in a very different spirit.

But, I must in justice to myself observe, that it was impossible for me, or for any one here, to entertain a suspicion of the kind: who could suppose that a man of Mr. Poinsett's standing and high character in his own country, would expose himself to a disavowal like that which he has recently met with? Who could imagine that while taking a most decided line here, he reckoned upon no support at home?—Who think, that while speaking and acting in the name of his Govt., and moving Heaven and earth in order to establish his influence here upon the ruins of ours,—that Govt. would be proclaiming principles perfectly consistent with that spirit of fair competition, which it is neither the wish nor the interest of Gt. Britain to oppose?

I could only judge by facts which I had before my eyes, and those facts are more than sufficient to bear me out in the line which I have taken.

You must not, however, suppose, that while resisting, openly an open attack, it has been at all my wish to excite sentiments of rivalry, or throw any obstacle in the way of those conciliatory views, which I knew to have been adopted by Govt. with the United States.

My line has been, from first to last, a defensive one; and so far from opposing Mr. Poinsett where his views do not clash with our interests, (for which I agree with you in thinking that there is no sort of necessity) he will find me ready and willing to assist him whenever I can.

His power to hurt is gone, his influence has been upon the decline ever since he failed so completely in the attempt to get Camacho's appointment thrown out, and the late proceedings at Washington have deprived him even of his most zealous partizans. Personally I have never disliked Mr. Poinsett, tho' there has been once or twice a sort of collision between us; but let him but meet me half way, and he will find me most ready to give up everything like opposition to him. But, I need dwell no further upon this subject: the inclosed copy of a Dispatch written just before your letter reached me, will shew you both the state of my feelings upon the subject, and those of the people here.

IX. WARD TO VAUGHAN.

MEXICO. 27 Octr. 1826.

My dear Vaughan,

The three Dispatches of which I inclose copies, contain, a peu pres, all that I have to say, about the present state of affairs here, in as far as regards the points which are most likely to interest you.

Canedo's motion, (No 114) like many other good ideas in this country, has led to nothing; Esteva who is Grand Master of the New York Lodges, has stopped proceedings entirely, by not sending in the information which Gt. [government?] is requested to give, under the plea of not having yet been able to procure it from the States. In the meantime party quarrels are running higher than ever: The Press teems with libels, —and so many gross personalities have been published,—so many old Revolutionary stories brought to light, that if Spain were paying them to destroy their own credit as a Nation, they could hardly perform the task more effectually.

The contest for the Elections has carried this animosity into every corner of the Federation. You hear everywhere of Yorkinos, and Borbonistas, which term has, I think, been of late applied to almost every one who does not belong to the New York sect,—but more particularly to Genl. Bravo, and all his friends, whom it is the object of the Yorkinos to exclude, *at any price*, from power. They do not reflect that a party which comprises a very large portion of the wealth and talent of the country, will not patiently see itself hunted down by a set of needy and desperate adventurers—At least, they must not be driven to extremities, or I see that the next Election for the Presidency, will not be decided without an appeal to arms.

You can have no idea, My dear Vaughan, of the sort of men with whom the Yorkinos have sought to fill their ranks:¹ Half pay officers,—clerks in public offices, (particularly in those under Esteva's control)—petty advocates, clergymen who are reduced to seek, by an affectation of Liberal views, that promotion which their characters have prevented them from obtaining before. Such are the elements of which the New York Lodges are composed,—and, with a sprinkling of names which ought not, certainly, to appear amongst such associates. Such the party

¹ "Without any disparagement to its members, of whom many are both useful and distinguished men, I may say that the largest proportion of the Affiliés of this society consisted of the *novi homines* of the Revolution. They are the ultra-Federalists, or democrats of Mexico, and profess the most violent hostility to Spain, and to the Spanish residents . . ." H. G. Ward, *Mexico* (London: 1829), Vol. II., p. 408. With regard to Poinsett's influence in this matter see his defense in Niles's *Register*, Vol. XXXIII., pp. 23-26. He published in Mexico *Exposición de la conducta política de los Estados Unidos para con las nuevas repúblicas de América*. The congress of Vera Cruz declared that "he conceived a project the most disorganizing and terrible for the republic; which was nothing more nor less than the establishment of the lodge of *York Free Masons*." Niles, *Ibid.*, p. 13.

An account is found in Ward's *Mexico*, Vol. II., pp. 407-408. Poinsett was instrumental in establishing York lodges of free masons. The Mexican masons had belonged in most cases to the Scotch rite. He says himself: "The rite of York existed before his arrival in this country. He found five lodges already established, and he done [sic] nothing more than send for charters for them from the grand lodge of New York, at their request to instal the grand lodge of Mexico." The "Yorkinos" and the "Escoceses" became rival political parties; the former the radicals and the latter the conservatives. Extreme bitterness and rancor characterized the relations between the parties and the accusations of each were in kind, though not in degree, very similar to those existing in this country in Washington's administration.—ED.

which wishes to monopolize all Public Employments, and to form a New York Congress, in order to give the Country a New York President also!

Guerrero¹ and Esteva are both talked of for this dignity. Genl. Barragan likewise, who has been induced, very recently, to inscribe his name upon the New York lists, in the hope of obtaining it.

I do not, however, think that the party has yet as much influence as it imagines: The elections in the States have not gone in their favour at all generally, and where they have succeeded (as at Toluca), the law of elections has been so grossly violated, that it is probable that the elections themselves will be annulled.

In the meantime pecuniary difficulties are increasing in consequence of the embarrassments of the house of Barclay and of the wise resolution of our merchants not to send another vessel here, until the present absurd system of duties is modified. In short, things are decidedly in a bad state, and had Mexico an enemy of even common activity, the consequences might be more serious than I have ever hitherto imagined.

I regret this the more because of the extent to which British capital is embarked here—Our companies require nothing now but tranquillity, and their success cannot be doubtful.

I am going to undertake a journey on the 1st. to Guanajuato and Zacatecas: here I can do no good, at present, and I believe that if my interference be required later, it will be the more effectual from my being known to be connected with neither of the great parties of the day. Poinsett has certainly done himself no good; by following a different line: He has all the odium of having created the sect which has given rise to those fatal Divisions by which the country is now torn to pieces, while Esteva has completely supplanted him in the management of its affairs.

X. PAKENHAM TO VAUGHAN.

Octr. 18/27.

I have already been once robbed and narrowly escaped being murdered at Noonday within pistol shot of the gate of the town; there is not such a cut-throat country I am sure in the world. Our house is opposite to a sort of half prison, half hospital, where the killed and wounded are deposited after every affray. Five minutes don't pass without our seeing a wounded or a dead man *carried* in there.

XI. PAKENHAM TO VAUGHAN.

MEXICO. Sepr. 24. 1828.

My dear Vaughan,

The last letter I received from you was dated the 28th. May. I now proceed to answer it by the New York Packet which promises to sail from Vera Cruz on the 1st. of next month. Since I last wrote

¹ Vicente Guerrero suppressed the Bravo or Montaña rebellion of 1828; candidate for the presidency, 1828; defeated by Pedraza in the election. Rebellion ensued and Guerrero became President in 1829.—ED.

to you the question which has exclusively occupied everybodys attention has been the election of the President who is to enter on his office early next year. The States voted on the 1st. of Sepr. and the result has been a majority of two in favor Genl. Gomez Pedraza—the present minister of War—. You are already aware that the Yorkino party has been for the last 3 years moving Heaven and earth to secure the election of Guerrero—Their defeat, constitutionally speaking, is therefore complete,—but they are not the sort of fellows to acquiesce peaceably in an arrangement which has no stronger foundation than a paper constitution to which they have all sworn. They have now taken up arms, and seem determined right or wrong to set aside the election of Pedraza and place Guerrero at the head of the Govt.

The appearance of things is truly alarming—The insurrection began at Xalapa in the first week of this month—where a General Santa Anna, a character who has successively served and betrayed every party which has figured in this country since the beginning of the revolutionary war, headed a tumultuous meeting that was held for the purpose of intimidating the legislature of that State, Vera Cruz, to rescind the vote it had given for Pedraza, and vote for Guerrero—the Congress had firmness enough to resist, and to suspend Santa Anna from his functions of V. Gov. of the State, accusing him of Sedition and directing the military commandant to place him under arrest.

To this Santa Anna submitted for three days,—when having matured his plans, he started from Xalapa with 300 men of the garrison whom he had seduced from their duty, and took possession of the castle of Perote, a fortress which commands the principal road from the Capital to the coast,—where he has collected a force of about 1000 men, consisting of deserters from Xalapa and Puebla, and mounted peasantry, a description of force which is very efficient in the sort of desultory warfare which he will probably endeavour to carry on. The Govt. are taking for this country very energetic measures to suppress this insurrection, and the Congress luckily are cordially seconding this effort. A great reaction has certainly taken place in the public feeling since January last, when it seemed all over with the 'Esoces' interest, had the Govt. then had occasion to apply to the Congress for any laws, which would have been contrary to the views of the Yorkino's, hardly a member of either character would have been found to vote for them,—now several measures aimed not only at Santa Anna and his followers but at the whole Yorkino system have been passed rapidly and without much discussion—1st. a law putting Santa Anna and his companions [to death] if within a certain time they do not lay down their arms—those who do will have their lives spared but they will undergo any other punishment which a military tribunal may think proper to sentence them to—2nd. a law for the better punishment of abuses of the liberty of the press—under the old law such offences being tried before a committee of the municipality, blasphemously called a "Jury," composed entirely of Yorkino's, condemned without mercy any publications contrary to their views, while any attack however

libellous or infamous against the opposite party enjoyed perfect impunity. You can have no idea of the atrocious and barefaced partiality with which the late law was administered,—There will be under the new one some chance of fair play. 3rdly. extraordinary powers, something like our suspension of the habeas Corpus act, have been voted to the President, which will enable the Governmt. to lay hold of the instigators of the mischief,—a measure which is likely to have the best effects. 4th. notice has been given for a motion for the suppression of Secret societies,—this is striking at the very root of the evil, and I sincerely hope it may be passed.

You must not be surprised to hear soon that Mr. Poinsett has been invited to walk off,—but I rather think that he is too cunning to let things come to that, and that in a few weeks we shall have the satisfaction of seeing him depart of his own accord.¹

Now to return to Santa Anna,—you will find his plan detailed in the No. of the Sol which I enclose,—to talk of annulling an election made by the Legislative bodies, is imprudent enough but to say that they shall proceed to elect such a particular person, is the greatest burlesque upon the elective system that has yet been brought before the public.

You will see that he has made use of the popular cry against the old Spaniards,—this will I think get him more recruits than the rest of his professed objects not excepting that of the forced election of Guerrero.

The greatest danger the Govt. have to fear is the instability of the troops, and the greatest precaution is required to be used in order not to increase the strength of Santa Anna by the defection of the soldiers sent against him. I do not however despair of the ultimate result, tho' I fear that untill the interval which the Constitution most unaccountably interposes between the election and installation of the new President as Governor, we shall not have many quiet moments.

"*Gritos*" will of course, take place in other parts of the country—but Santa Anna's is probably the worst we shall have to encounter.

¹ The plan of Montañó issued by the Escoceses or Novenarios at the end of 1827 embraces four articles: suppression of secret societies; dismissal of the cabinet; dismissal of Poinsett; scrupulous enforcement of the laws. See the document in Ward's *Mexico*, Vol. II., p. 565.—ED.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Industrial Evolution. By CARL BÜCHER. Translated from the third German edition by S. MORLEY WICKETT, Ph.D. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1901. Pp. xi, 393.)

DR. CARL BÜCHER, one of Germany's ablest economists, has been introduced to a wider circle of readers through the translation from the third edition of *Entstehung der Staatswirthschaft*, the work which has given its author his clearest right to the position he now occupies in the esteem of scholars. This translation fulfils an oft-expressed hope and is therefore a peculiar gratification to those American students who have enjoyed the stimulating influence of the author's lectures and teaching.

The first edition of the book appeared in 1893 and attracted such widespread attention that a detailed review of its contents seems almost superfluous. It will be recalled that the first essay which gave its title to the whole, traced the economic development of society through its succeeding stages from the independent domestic and town systems to a fully matured national economy. It captivated its readers by its mastery of historical detail in a period extending over thousands of years, by its power to interpret facts and to find in them the broad lines of historical evolution, and by the exhilarating quality of its style which carried the reader irresistibly with it in its onward rush. In pursuance of the same method the writer presented in a succeeding chapter an "Historical Survey of Industrial Systems" in which house-work, wage-work, handicraft, house industry and factory work find their places in historical sequence. These two essays were much criticised for inaccuracies of detail by certain historians whose methods of work are of the microscopic order. In reply Dr. Bücher rightly contended that these chapters were studies in economic theory rather than economic history and that such criticisms were entirely beside the point. Rapid outline sketches of extended periods have their place quite as truly as have the more detailed and labored investigations in more limited fields.

In the edition under review, a revised form of the two essays just mentioned is preceded by chapters on "Primitive Economic Conditions" and "The Economic Life of Primitive Peoples," delightful ethnological sketches in which special attention is given to economic phenomena. The method pursued in these studies is that of taking peoples of different stocks and of various cultural stages and considering the economic phenomena separately, a method fully justified "provided that, from the prodigious mass of disconnected facts that fill ethnology like a great lumber-room, we succeed in bringing a considerable number under a

common denominator and rescuing them from the mystic interpretations of curiosity hunters and mythologizing visionaries." The fifth chapter on "The Decline of the Handicrafts" discusses the vitality of hand work as a form of industrial activity and will be found of special interest to American readers. The author does not share the views of those writers who predict the annihilation of this class of workers. Handiwork is not perishing, he says, but is rather being restricted to the country where its peculiar advantages can best be realized. These five chapters form a treatise on economic history of so stimulating a character that we may safely predict for the volume an extended use in American institutions as an introduction to the study of economic theory. Of the remaining portions of the volume the chapters on "Union of Labor and Labor in Common," "Division of Labor," and "Organization of Work and the Formation of Social Classes" are thoughtful analyses of phases in our industrial development. The two chapters on "The Genesis of Journalism" and "Internal Migrations of Population and the Growth of Towns" might well have been omitted as destroying the unity of the work and possessing local rather than general interest.

The edition reflects great credit on its translator, Dr. Wickett. It shows painstaking care in its preparation, has closely followed the German text, and presents in a gratifying degree the graphic style of the original.

FRANK HAIGH DIXON.

The Early Age of Greece. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY. In two volumes. Vol. I. (Cambridge: University Press. 1901. Pp. xvi, 684.)

GROTE doubted the wisdom of Bishop Thirlwall in casting discredit upon the statement of Herodotus (i. 57, 58) that the ancient Pelasgi were barbarians. What would he have said of the new theory of Professor Ridgeway which makes them the original inhabitants of the greater part of the Hellenic peninsula, and the authors of the splendid "Mycenaean" civilization!

Two comparatively late discoveries have slowly changed the attitude of the best scholars toward the problem of the Mycenaean culture. One is the discovery that the source of Aryan migration, at least in the periods to be considered in discussing the Mycenaean problem, was not the central tablelands of Asia, but central and southern Europe; the other is the discovery that the "Achaean" civilization represented in the Homeric poems is not identical with, but distinct from and later than the Mycenaean. And as the rapid progress of scientific excavation has enlarged the area over which the Mycenaean culture is known to have prevailed, and at the same time brought to light more and more impressive evidence of its richness and grandeur, it has become more and more imperative that some rational answer be given, at least provisionally, to the question—what was the people which produced this culture? This volume of Professor Ridgeway's marshals the archaeological, literary and linguistic evidence on which his identification of the Mycenaean people with the

ancient Pelasgians is based; a second volume, already in the press, will present the evidence for this identification to be drawn from institutions and religions.

The first chapter gives a convenient survey of the prehistoric remains and their distribution, compiled, of course, from the works of Schliemann, Furtwaengler and Loeschcke (not Loesche, as the name is continually misspelled), Helbig, Tsountas and Manatt, Frazer and the current archaeological journals. After passing in review the whole area in which Mycenaean remains have come to light, the chapter closes with a brief estimate of that remarkable civilization. It was characterized by remarkable skill in architecture, by the universal use of bronze as a metal (succeeding an employment of stone for weapons and implements), by lustrous pottery of artistic form and ornamentation, and by inhumation, not cremation of the dead. The authors of this culture of the eastern Aegean brought it to a glorious zenith between 1500 and 1200 B. C. When not disturbed by conquest, as in Attica, it passed gradually over into the culture of the classical period. "Our first real knowledge of the physical aspect of the race who produced the Mycenaean culture, has now been given us by the discovery at Cnossus of a beautiful 'life-size painting of a youth with an European and almost classical Greek profile.'"

The second chapter, the *pièce de résistance* of the book (pp. 80-292), asks and answers the question "Who were the Makers?" "What people produced the Mycenaean civilization is the most important problem in archaic Greek history." The chapter is an expansion of the author's paper in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for 1896 entitled, "What People made the objects called Mycenaean?" It was natural, after the brilliant discoveries of Schliemann in 1876, that scholars should hasten to identify the culture of the Mycenaean age with that revealed in the Homeric poems. It was "Achaean." But closer study since then has brought out such remarkable differences between the two cultures as to make their identification more than doubtful. A survey is therefore taken of the various races who have dwelt on the spots where Mycenaean remains have been discovered, in an effort to determine which was the most probable author of the Mycenaean culture. In Peloponnesus and Crete, the two most important centers of Mycenaean culture, a strong argument is developed that an indigenous, melanochroous population, which became the "Helots" of the one and the "Pelasgians" of the other after conquest first by the Achaeans and next by the Dorian Hellenes, was the author of the so called Mycenaean civilization. The claims of the Dorians are easily disposed of. The Achaean claims are with more difficulty, but no less surely, disproved, beginning with the Peloponnesus, and gradually covering all the regions in which Mycenaean remains have been found. The Greek traditions show that "whilst there is no tradition of an Achaean occupation of Attica and other prominent seats of the Bronze Age culture, in every instance we could point to legends which connected the monuments with the Pelasgians. According to Homer, the Achaean civilization belonged to the Iron Age, and was therefore later than the

Mycenaean." According to Greek tradition this Achaeal domination lasted for about 150 years, and during this period the full Mycenaean culture suffered decline.

The claims put forward for Carians, Phoenicians, Hittites, Goths and Byzantines as the authors of the Mycenaean culture are successively and more easily refuted, and the fact that different bodies of Pelasgians were known under different names, as Minyans, Athenians, Arcadians, Danaoi, Argeioi, Ionians, is also successfully explained. It appears that "all the pre-Achaeal royal families of Argolis, Laconia, Messenia, Arcadia, Corinth, Megara, Attica, Phocis, Boeotia, and Thessaly, and even Libya, all derived their lineage from Poseidon, from whom were also sprung the non-Achaeal Phaeacians, and the Cyclops of the west; whilst on the other hand the Achaeal chiefs were sprung from Zeus." The Ionians of Asia Minor had the cult of Poseidon as their common bond of union, while the worship of Zeus at Athens, Olympia, Ithome, and Crete was of comparatively recent date. Such conclusions are fair samples of the unifying results of Professor Ridgeway's main contention. Hitherto fragmentary items of archaic Greek history are given an appropriate place in a fair edifice of historical evolution. Although the evidence from Crete is as yet insufficient to enable us to judge of the relative age of the Mycenaean culture there as compared with that on the mainland of Greece, still legend and geography unite in indicating that "the focus of the Mycenaean grand style" was on the mainland of Greece; not in Attica, but in the richer Argos and Boeotia. "It was probably under the shelter of the great walls of Tiryns, Mycenae, and Goulas, that the Pelasgian art took its highest form."

Chapters III.-IX. support this main contention, which is thus far based mainly on the literary traditions of the Hellenes, with all the available archaeological evidence. "The Homeric Age" (chap. III.) is shown to have differed from the preceding Mycenaean age in many essential criteria of culture. "Whence came the Achaeans?" (chap. IV.) is answered by tracing this fair-haired Celtic race from "the head of the Adriatic and from the great fair-haired communities of central Europe." "The early Iron Age in Europe" (chap. V.) attempts to show "that at Dodona itself, in Bosnia, and in all central Europe" there are traces of the same "Achaeal" culture which the Homeric poems exhibit. "The round Shield" (chap. VI.) is shown to be the characteristic both of the Achaeans and of the folk of central Europe. As regards "Inhumation, Cremation, and the Soul" (chap. VII.), the practice of cremation and the attendant conceptions of the soul are shown to have proceeded from the forest regions of Europe down into the Pelasgian peninsula. "The Brooch" (chap. VIII.) is in like manner shown to have passed from north to south, as well as "Iron" (chap. IX.). This group of chapters is much the most satisfactory part of the book, and will provoke far less controversy than the rather strained literary interpretations of chapter III., or the daring identifications in the last chapter on "The Homeric Dialect." Here the theory that the

Homeric poems were composed on the mainland of Greece, already successfully launched by English scholars, is ably defended, and the surprising conclusions are ably drawn that the autochthonous Pelasgian race in ancient Thessaly and Arcadia, when covering the larger part of the lower peninsula, and before the intrusion of the fair-haired Achaeans, developed the literary Aeolic dialect and the hexameter verse, in which the Homeric poems were first composed. These poems are therefore Pelasgian, with an Achaean infusion after the Achaeans became the conquering and ruling caste.

Many details in this long and variegated argument will doubtless be disputed and disproved. The book invites *adversaria* as much as a book of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff; but its main contentions are likely to maintain themselves, and they reflect great credit on the penetration and comprehensiveness of the best English classical scholarship.

BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

Roman Public Life. By A. H. J. GREENIDGE. [Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities.] (London and New York: Macmillan. 1901. Pp. xx, 484.)

In his preface the author states that "the object of this work is to trace the growth of the Roman constitution, and to explain its working during the two phases of its maturity, the developed Republic and the Principate." It was his desire "to touch, however briefly, on all the important aspects of public life, central, municipal, and provincial; and, thus, to exhibit the political genius of the Roman in connection with all the chief problems of administration which it attempted to solve."

Those who are interested in the progress of scholarship in the field of Roman history have felt a great need of a convenient, up-to-date manual of the Roman constitution. To supply this want several books have recently appeared, among which may be mentioned Taylor's *Constitutional and Political History of Rome* and Abbott's *History and Description of Roman Political Institutions*, as well as the volume now before us. A merit which Mr. Greenidge shares with the two authors here mentioned is the acceptance of Mommsen's view of the imperial constitution—a view necessarily familiar to the Germans but comparatively unknown to the English reader. We were taught by Gibbon, Merivale, and Duruy that the Augustan government was an absolute monarchy disguised in republican forms; but Mommsen has demonstrated that it was in fact a dyarchy, or joint rule of the *Princeps* and the Senate. Although Mr. Greenidge has well treated the constitution of the dyarchy, his space has not permitted him to show how it developed into the absolute monarchy of Diocletian. While regretting this limitation, the reader hitherto unacquainted with Mommsen's view will doubtless feel grateful for the light he receives from this volume. The description of the mature republican constitution, on the other hand, has nothing new for the English reader. But the treatment of this subject shows experience in dealing with legal and con-

stitutional questions and a fair appreciation of the mutual relations of the various governmental forces.

The historical introduction to his work, however, is substantially worthless, based as it is on the groundless hypothesis of an original "patrician state." It is true that the view Mr. Greenidge here represents is still widely accepted; but there have always been eminent scholars who have protested against this absurd fiction, and we may reasonably hope that the rising generation will abandon it altogether. Naturally those who object to the hypothesis in question do not believe that the *gentes* and the *curiae* were exclusively patrician. The *gens* in fact has been thoroughly misunderstood. It is not a primitive institution, but developed with the rise of the aristocracy. In Greece, for instance, it is post-Homeric. Again, in his discussion of the Servian "constitution," though he admits that the organization known by this name was simply military, he persists in confusing the army with the political assembly of the centuries. This confusion, however, he shares with many other writers. He has made a serious mistake, too, in adopting from Mommsen the distinction between *comitia* and *concilium* according to which the former signifies an assembly of the whole people, and the latter of a part of the people. These definitions were probably invented by Laelius Felix, a jurist of the second century A. D.; at least they can be traced no farther back and were certainly unknown in republican times, when the assemblies were still living. The republican annalists, represented by Livy, did not hesitate to apply the term *concilium* to the gathering of the whole people, and were equally ready to call the plebeian assembly a *comitia*.

Enough has perhaps been said, by way of criticism on Mr. Greenidge's book, to raise the question whether the conventional view of early Roman history which he represents is not radically wrong, and whether a more critical method of investigation directed by an historical rather than a juristic spirit would not yield more satisfactory results.

G. W. BOTSFORD.

A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages. By STANLEY LANE-POOLE, Professor of Arabic at Trinity College, Dublin. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xv, 382.)

THE monuments of ancient Egypt are so numerous, and often on so grand a scale, its civilization goes back to such a remote past, the imagination of children is stirred so early by the story of Joseph and of the Hebrews in bondage, that it is perhaps not surprising that to many Egypt is simply the land of the pyramids, the land of the Pharaohs and the Exodus, and that to them the whole history of Egypt during the Middle Ages is a sealed book. Many, no doubt, have a feeling that the history of the country during this period has little of interest or of importance. Nor is the general reader entirely to blame for having this impression. We have a great number of books on ancient Egyptian

history, archaeology, etc., but, as our author points out in his preface, "in this volume the History of Egypt in the Middle Ages, from its conquest by the Saracens in 640 to its annexation by the Ottoman Turks in 1517, is for the first time related in a continuous narrative apart from the general history of the Mohammedan caliphate." Many a traveller who has admired the monuments of Saracenic art in Egypt, and has wished for some clear and succinct account of the rulers who left such beautiful memorials of their reigns, has felt the need of just such a work as this. So that a good book on this subject is sure of a welcome, not only from students, but also from travellers and from the general reader.

Our author has divided his book into eleven chapters, entitled respectively: "The Arab Conquest, 639-641"; "A Province of the Caliphate, 641-868"; "Tulūn and Ikhshid, 868-969"; "The Shia Revolution, 969"; "The Fātimid Caliphs, 969-1094"; "The Attack from the East, 969-1171"; "Saladin, 1169-1193"; "Saladin's Successors (the Ayyūbids), 1193-1250"; "The First Mamlūks, 1250-1279"; "The House of Kalāūn, 1279-1382"; "The Circassian Mamlūks, 1382-1517". Besides the general list of authorities (pp. xiii and xiv), there is, at the head of each chapter, a list of authorities, and also, in the case of most of the chapters, lists of monuments, inscriptions, coins, etc. The value of these lists is at once apparent.

In a work in which there is so much of interest it will be possible to touch on merely a very few points. The author gives a very good account of the conquest of Egypt. In judging it, as in judging any discussion of the events connected with this period, it must not be forgotten that, as the author says (p. 13), "the chronology of the Arab conquest of Egypt is almost hopelessly bewildering." What the author has to say about the capitulation of Alexandria is interesting, especially his treatment of the legend of the destruction of "the Alexandrian library." In view of the lack of evidence for this particular story, it would seem about time for us to cease being obliged to read of this alleged act of Moslem vandalism. But such legends die hard. It is interesting to notice what the author has to say about the steadfastness of the Copts in adhering to Christianity, in spite of difficulties and of the temptations to go over to Islam. Note-worthy too is the independent spirit of the Kadi in a country and at a time when one is usually inclined to believe that bribery and servility are the constant rule. The table of governors and chief ministers of Egypt (pp. 45-58 inclusive), will be found valuable for reference. The same may be said of the table of alleged descent of the Fātimid Caliphs (p. 116), and the table of the Ayyūbid dynasties (to face p. 212).

The account of the caliph Hākim is particularly vivid and interesting. The life of this mad ruler had in it enough fantastic elements, and in his death he secured from one sect that recognition of himself which he had sought from his people during his lifetime, for, as we read on page 134, "to this day the Druzes in the Lebanon worship the Divine Reason incarnate in his singularly unworthy person, and believe that one day he will come again in majesty and reveal truth and judgment." The account

of Saladin (pp. 190-211) is partly abridged from the author's valuable *Life of Saladin*, and is well done, as are such descriptions of the movements of the Crusaders as fall within the scope of this work.

The description of the Mamlūk civilization, part of it reprinted, with emendations, from the author's *Art of the Saracens in Egypt*, chapter III., is especially valuable. The note on page 253, in which the system of Mamlūk names and titles is explained, will, no doubt, be welcome to many who have puzzled over the subject. Especial attention may be called to the account of the career of Beybars and that of Nasir.

Pages 359 to 382, inclusive, are occupied by a good index. The book is well printed on good paper and the illustrations add to its interest and value. The story of medieval Egypt is, in many respects, a fascinating one, and this story Professor Lane-Poole has told well. He knows his subject, his style is interesting and vivid, and an occasional touch of humor gives additional life to his narrative. Both Dr. Lane-Poole and the publishers are to be congratulated for this, the sixth volume of the great history of Egypt.

J. R. JEWETT.

The Spanish People, their Origin, Growth and Influence. By MARTIN A. S. HUME, editor of the Calendars of Spanish State Papers. [The Great Peoples Series.] (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1901. Pp. xix, 535.)

IN the present book Mr. Hume offers an analysis of the Spanish people, built up about a condensed outline of the history of Spain from the earliest times to the present day. His special aim is to illustrate and explain the development of the Spaniard in the light of his origin and surroundings, and stress is laid, accordingly, rather on results than on the details of processes. Still the book is far from barren of the facts usually sought by the general reader of history, while the results reached along the lines that lead more directly toward the author's specific end will commend it to the more thoughtful and discerning student.

The book's great merit lies in the fact that it is the production of one who has a clear view of the greater part of the Spanish historical field, with a distinct understanding of its problems. The best portions are the chapters devoted to the times between the end of the Moorish domination and the accession of the Bourbons. It is here that the author is most and best at home, and his familiarity with the course of things in all Spain during these centuries lends him a sure touch and an excellent appreciation of the relative importance of events. There is perhaps no clearer account available of the processes determined in the peninsula by the various fate of the West-Spanish kingdoms during the struggle with the Moors; while the relations of Castile and Leon with Aragon, with the effect of their divergent political policies and economic systems upon united Spain are excellently brought out. The best of the whole book is the keen appreciation the author shows of the great influence exercised by the different economic conditions obtaining in the different parts of

Spain; although it were to be wished that his feeling for the institutional possibilities of his subject had been deeper.

So much praise can scarcely be accorded the generalizations made from the author's understanding of the historical apparatus at his disposal. Mr. Hume has not escaped the dangers to which the nature of his study especially exposed him. He has been drawn into making out of the mixed origin of the Spanish people at once a thesis and an explanatory formula, in the light of which he explains events and personalities. Thus he forces the influence of race and tradition far beyond its normal value, and discounts the influence of the personal element at all times. In his applications of his formula he occasionally lets his conclusions explain one another, and his deductions are too frequently *ex parte*; he lacks catholicity. For instance, in speaking of the accession of Henry of Trastámara, he says (pp. 218-219): "The personal character of Pedro the Cruel is a question of secondary importance to our present purpose. . . . But it is certain that had he been allowed to continue the policy of Alphonso IX., by which the territorial nobility were being gradually divested of their power, much of the turbulence and bloodshed of the next hundred years would have been avoided." It was precisely Pedro's "personal character" that made the nobles refuse to allow him to go on.

If we approach the book from still another side, it seems to be written without a due sense of proportion in the larger lines. The hasty and unsatisfactory treatment of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries suggests that for Mr. Hume the development of the Spanish character comes to an end with the close of the seventeenth century. This needs no refuting; the two centuries just passed are unattractive in Spain, but far from unimportant. An amusing touch of insularity in the author is the omission of all mention of the Capitulation of Bailén, an event that overweighs in significance a wilderness of the murders and torturings for which Mr. Hume finds space. The chapters on art, architecture and literature are not ill-conceived, but are almost entirely at second hand and suffer accordingly.

The book is furnished with a good index, and with a bibliography that leaves much to be desired both in regard to arrangement and to choice of titles. It is quite uncritical: good and bad, modern and antiquated stand side by side without comment. It abounds with small but inexcusable inaccuracies and inconsistencies. A more serious matter is the misquotation of Dozy's *Recherches sur l'histoire et la littérature de l'Espagne pendant le moyen-âge* (Leyden, 1881): the title given on pp. 519-521 belongs to the smaller work first published in 1849. Still less to be forgiven is the carelessness, to call it nothing worse, that permits the entry of the works of Schack (p. 521) as Spanish translations from Valera and Mier. One notes with surprise the absence of any reference to the work of Dierx, Schäfer-Schirmacher, Lembke, Desdevises du Désert and Henry C. Lea. Finally, the book would gain greatly by the addition of full critical apparatus. BENJAMIN PARSONS BOURLAND.

An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England.

By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. x, 312.)

THIS is a text-book designed for college and high school classes. The author makes no claim to originality. He has undertaken to bring the essential facts in the economic evolution of a great industrial nation within the comprehension of the novice. Of the three text-books on English industrial history brought out by the Macmillan Company in the past five years Cheyney's gives best promise of finding favor with American schools and American teachers. Miss MacArthur's digest of Cunningham's *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* suffers for want of the illustrative matter that renders its great original so attractive. Townsend Warner gives the student a series of interesting and valuable essays rather than a consistent exposition of the evolution of industrial forms. Neither book is provided with bibliography, maps, or illustrations. Cheyney, on the other hand, supplies thirty-five cuts illustrative of the industrial life of England, authentic drawings of manor houses, manor lands, and gild halls, photographs of open field cultivation and farm buildings, together with facsimiles of a town charter, a gild roll, and a table of assize. The educative value of this pictorial evidence can hardly be overestimated. Such pictures as that of child labor in the coal mines, taken from the Commission Report of 1842, illuminate the subject more than pages of description. To the English student, for whom survivals of a past industrial order are familiar memories, these illustrations may be superfluous. Not so with the denizen of the new world who must reconstruct in imagination economic organisms to the comprehension of which experience gives him no clue. A valuable series of maps—the physical make-up of the British Isles, trade routes, medieval and modern, the distribution of population according to the poll tax of 1377, the hearth tax of 1750, and the census of 1891—serve further to define and actualize the student's conceptions. Each chapter, moreover, is provided with bibliographical notes, indicating the most available authorities and some of the more accessible source material.

In respect to aids to class work, Mr. Cheyney has greatly improved upon his predecessors. His discussion of economic phenomena, however, often leaves something to be desired. The text-book that is to serve as a beginner's guide must be, above all things, suggestive. It should be packed with information like a traveller's hold-all. Nothing may be overlooked, nothing omitted that is essential to the student's apprehension of the new idea. Success depends on a judicious use of space. Every word must be chosen with view to its significance, every sentence must be freighted with meaning. Judged by this standard, our author not infrequently fails. He allows himself to use vague and general terms that must plunge his reader into a state of baffling uncertainty. For example (p. 42), "week work was required sometimes for one number of days in the week during part of the year, for another during

the remainder." There is no hint of the necessity for securing a larger amount of service in the planting and harvest seasons that determined the variation. It is unfortunate to state (p. 18) that "the Danegeld was still collected from time to time, though under a different name," when, with the use of no more words, the substitution of carucage by Henry II. could have been explained. The assertion that the church in the days of Lanfranc and Anselm "was not so conspicuous as in Anglo-Saxon times" (p. 18) certainly requires justification. But the term "landlord," when used to describe the feudal relation between proprietor and cultivator, is positively misleading.

Some fifty pages of the three hundred and twelve at our author's disposal have been devoted to chronological reviews of national affairs prefixed to appropriate chapters. The purpose is evidently to supply an historical setting for the economic phenomena to be considered. This is really a waste of space. It would be better to suggest that the teacher who cannot presuppose in his students a sufficient knowledge of political history should refer them to a good text-book. No pedagogic purpose can be served by the mere rehearsal of the dynastic changes during the Lancastrian period so hurried as to allow of no reference to the social and political consequences of the destruction of the leading baronial families. So, in the sixteenth century, the succession of the Tudor kings is carefully stated, but there is no space given to the discovery of the new world or to the opening up of the sea route to the orient—events of transcendent importance to the commercial development of England.

Turning from questions of method to subject-matter, the severest critic must concede that Mr. Cheyney's account of economic conditions is beyond praise. His descriptions are clear, explicit and vivid. Details are presented in so logical a sequence that the bygone industrial form, the manor or the gild, is made to appear a rational and consistent whole. It is difficult to set forth in brief compass the manifold and varying phenomena of medieval life. Brevity seems to require definite and universal statements. This difficulty Mr. Cheyney has mastered. The confused and often conflicting customs of medieval society are recorded, while the significance of varying usage is rendered evident.

Apparently our author means to avoid controversial ground. Else why does he leave the student to wrestle with the impartial statement that the Norman administrative system was "either brought over from Normandy or developed in England"? It is to spare his readers a difficult controversy, perhaps, that Mr. Cheyney has chosen to open the history of the manor with the thirteenth century. The mass of detailed information to be found in "extents," bailiffs' accounts, and manor court rolls, serves to bring thirteenth century agrarian conditions into the full light of day, and the teacher may well hesitate to conduct his students back into the dim past, where records are scanty and conflicting evidence renders categorical statements untenable. But the alternative is more demoralizing to the interests of scholarship. The student ought not to rest satisfied with the checker-board puzzle presented by the open field

and raise no question as to the how and why of this ingenious waste of labor. The discussion of primitive land tenure presented in Seeborn's *Tribal System in Wales* is not beyond the comprehension of high school classes. The youngest student of industrial history should be encouraged to read *The English Village Community* and to trace the manor back to its origin, under the guidance of a master. Later researches may lead him to different conclusions, but that can do him no harm, whereas the failure to confront a problem and attempt its solution must dull his intellectual curiosity. Some suggestion as to the *raison d'être* of the manor system might have been given without reference to origins.

Notwithstanding serious defects, Cheyney's work surpasses that of his predecessors as an all-round, symmetrical representation of the economic evolution of England. The successive industrial forms are treated in just proportion; each institution is made to appear a part of its own social environment however alien to modern understanding; every advance in agriculture, in manufactures, in commerce and finance is given its due weight, the treatment of the origin and effect of banking being especially satisfactory. The results of government action in establishing trade monopolies, negotiating commercial treaties, levying import duties, and offering bounties on exports are accurately estimated as well as the limitations to the effectiveness of statute as compared with economic law.

In so brief a treatise many subjects of importance must be omitted; what and where is a matter of personal judgment. One is tempted, however, to record a protest against an economic discussion of sixteenth century England that ignores the wide-spread vagabondage engendered by the agricultural revolution and the debasing of the currency. So again, in treating nineteenth century conditions, our author ignores a similar epidemic of pauperism consequent on enclosures, the factory organization of textile industries, and protective tariffs. Pauperism is not a negligible quantity in a discussion of economic evolution. It may rightly be considered a social-disease no less destructive of national prosperity than the Black Death. The attempts to cope with it—the new poor law, organized charity and various provisions for “the submerged tenth”—are quite as significant items in a *résumé* of the remedial work of the past century as are factory laws and the growth of trades unions. The reverse side of industrial progress is again ignored in recounting the repeal of the corn laws. The ultimate effects of free trade in food stuffs is not suggested. In matter of fact, the fall in the price of farm produce due to repeal and to cheapened transportation has well-nigh ruined farmer and landlord alike, has called forth more than one Commission inquiry, and has given rise to a wide-spread demand for “fair trade.”

Mr. Cheyney's book would have been rendered far more useful to the average reader by marginal references to the original authorities on points inadequately treated in the text. More frequent quotations from contemporary records would have given greater vividness and actuality to description. Examples of bailiffs' accounts in which competitive wages are recorded only to be stricken out in order that the statute wage

might be substituted, would demonstrate the failure of fourteenth century legislation. Medieval statute-makers had a commendable fashion of detailing the evils that their prohibitory enactments were meant to remedy. Many of their preambles are well worth quoting in evidence of contemporary opinion. Not even in the bibliographical notes do the original authorities receive sufficient attention. Whenever possible, the student should be put in possession of the first hand material for the author's conclusion. No study of domestic manufactures is complete without De Foe's account of the cloth weavers of Yorkshire. The disadvantages of open field agriculture have never been so well described as in Arthur Young's *Philippic*. Over against Alfred's arraignment of the employers of factory labor, should be set Ure's utilitarian philosophy. The full significance of the losing fight made by the agricultural laborers for a living wage can hardly be understood by an American reader without reference to the *Autobiography of Joseph Arch*.

KATHARINE COMAN.

A History of the English Church. Edited by the Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., F.S.A., Dean of Winchester, and the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. In seven volumes. Vol. I. *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest (597-1066)*. By the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A.; Vol. II. *The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I. (1066-1272)*. By W. R. W. STEPHENS; Vol. III. *The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. By W. W. CAPES. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899-1901. Pp. xix, 444; xiii, 351; xi, 391.)

ANY one occupied with church history finds that down to the sixteenth century his imagination resides in Rome. From Rome he looks abroad to descry only those larger matters that loom above local horizons and enter into the general prospect. If this imaginative position secures perspective and clearness of general construction it fails to appreciate fully the manner in which the church system bore upon the national and parochial and individual life. The volumes of this series dealing with the English church to the close of the eighteenth century will be of special value as they lend concrete significance to the general account and explain the development of the institution which has so deeply affected both English and American life. The three volumes before our notice are a guarantee of scholarship for the whole series. A certain nationalist stamp on the Christian institutions of England may justify the title of the "English Church" before Henry VIII.'s time, but the first two volumes would have been the better had the authors conceived their theme a little more clearly as the history of the Catholic church in England.

With something of clerical feeling, Hunt dates the birth of the English church not from the conversion and baptism of the English but from

the consecration of Augustine as Archbishop. In the same spirit a large amount of the book is given to detail about appointments to prelaties and abbacies. The author is not wholly to blame for the absence of intellectual interests. It is not without meaning that John Scotus got his system out of English bounds and that his English pupils are reported to have stabbed him to death with their metal pens. Down to Wycliffe, England is easily omitted from any history of doctrine. It was a period of undisturbed theological slumber. The clergy were dispensers of sacraments and rulers of an institution. The only hint in Hunt's volume of a consideration of doctrine is when in the tenth century Abbot Aelfric echoes the eucharistic theory of Ratramnus of Corbie. Hunt ignores completely the effort of F. C. Conybeare to discover in the Celtic Christianity of Britain the early adoptionist christology and he credits no qualitative influence to the Celtic missions save that of an exaggerated asceticism. Blaming that excess, the author nevertheless enters into the spirit of the lives which he records and is generous in the ascription of holiness to men who earned the title by much fasting. If the long dispute about the date of Easter is the only thing to break the seemingly monotonous uniformity of early Christianity in England, the uniformity is most conspicuous in the constant miracles. In these the author has a singular interest and although he notices many simply as believed or, as in the case of Dunstan's pulling the devil's nose, attempts a rationalistic explanation, he is deferential if not credulous and in the preface argues for the acceptance of some miracles on the ground of evidence and suitability of character. Rejection of some is necessary because the works were contrary to the revealed will of God, but miracle in general is credible as the action of a law higher than that of the earthly universe. We hear much, therefore, of healings and visions and omens and incorrupt bodies of saints, but the line is distinctly drawn at a miraculous supply of mead for a drinking bout.

These things and the occupancy of sees claiming so much attention, there is no conception of historical development. None is found or explained. We have simply the succession of things which happened in ecclesiastical annals. One who is interested in the growth of the indulgence system turns to the English custom of money commutation of penalties only to find an incidental denial that this was due to church law. Naturally therefore Hunt fails to grasp any feature of church life as a problem for historical explanation. A typical instance is the monastic revival in the tenth century. This is treated simply as an importation of the Cluny reform into England, but, by Hunt's own account, Dunstan and Aethelwold seem to have, independently of the foreign model, yielded with new ardor to the claim of the religious ideal. What conditions stimulated them? We learn only the fact of their procedure. King Eadgar pressed the monastic reform but he was himself a profligate. His procedure is left all the less clear by Hunt's rejection of the story of doing penance to gain coronation. At Eadgar's death there was an anti-monastic reaction, described as political and social. Asking what political and

social interests were involved we get only a passing hint that the nobles lost control of the minster lands when the monks displaced the secular clergy. Why, again, did bishops aid in expelling the secular clergy with injurious results for themselves? A distinct feature of the English revival was the establishment of royal supremacy over convents. Simony and the inheritance of church estates by priestly families have only a passing mention and the impression left by Hunt is that attacks on clerical marriage were only an indirect result of the convent reform. Certainly however Eadgar attacked the marriage of the secular clergy and attempts were made to deprive married priests of their benefices. It may therefore be believed that English churchmen analyzed the problem of their time more thoroughly than is indicated and that they shared more fully the ideals of contemporary reformers on the continent. The insular point of view and the confinement of attention to the reform of the convents seem to have obscured some of the facts. One detail may be noted. The world's end "was expected at the beginning of the year 1000 in England as well as in Western Christendom generally." This is explanatory of a prediction in the Blickling homilies which were earlier than 971 and are not mentioned in Professor Burr's recent paper. Abbo of Fleury taught in England shortly after the editing of these homilies, and his apparent ignorance of them or of their popular effect makes against an English panic. He testifies only to an obscure earlier sermon in France.

In general method the second volume resembles the first. It is for the most part a sufficiently minute account of institutional happenings of local and national interest but without the fullness and emphasis on certain greater episodes and personalities which we should expect. In particular, the treatment of Becket cannot compare with Milman's in interest and distinctness. The reader fails to see in their full meaning certain critical events, which by their subsequent effects gave a certain plot and movement to the story of the English Church and should be salient in the literary construction, as the Conqueror's attempted separation of civil and ecclesiastical authority, the evils of simony and extortion under William Rufus, the reformatory charter of Henry I., and the appointment of Archbishop William of Corbeil as papal legate. The author knows the meaning of these things but he does not make them loom large enough out of the detail of his book. It is a misfortune too that the student of church history does not learn more of the attitude of English churchmen to the great Gregorian programme. The battle of principles was being fought out in England. The struggle over investiture was brought to a compromise in England first of all. The demand for clerical celibacy was not so easily successful there as elsewhere, but the demand was certainly stronger than Stephens reports. His statement that the secular clergy took no vow of celibacy is not to be reconciled with the seventh canon of Westminster (1102). It would seem that this statement is due to a mistranslation of *profiteri*, for, in citing the canons of Westminster (1076), *non ordinare nisi prius profiteantur ut uxores non habeant* is rendered "not ordain any one un-

less he declare himself to be unmarried," while the context (Wilkins, I., 367), clearly makes it a pledge of future celibacy. If we wonder that marriage was entered into in spite of such an engagement we may recall that Alexander III. held that only a *votum solenne*, not a *votum simplex*, prevented marriage. As for the Gregorian idea in general it is evident that English prelates conceived it more in the sense of independence from the temporal power than in the sense of subordination to the papacy. They were affronted by the subserviency of John and Henry III. to papal feudalism. Englishmen, it is true, took small part in the great publicist debate, but without some indication that Anselm and Becket and others had a knowledge of the issues beyond the detailed incidents of their English experience they are not comprehended by the reader. Particularly is this true of Becket. The prelate to whom John of Salisbury dedicated his *Policraticus* had, as his letters show, a grasp of principle that relieves the aspect of arrogance and obstinacy. However, the eye of Stephens is for action rather than thought and for him as for Hunt there is a total absence of the history of theological ideas. Something might possibly have been gleaned but hardly by an author who finds Lanfranc's Augustinian view of the eucharist remarkable.

If the preceding books are sometimes wearisome by detail without perspective, the delightful work of Capes has not a dull page. It is packed with life. The period is rich in interest and the reader finds a mass of valuable facts skilfully constructed with a sense of just proportions and with an artistic imagination that presents the picture of English life in its vital movement with accomplished ease. We get the broader national and international aspects, but at the same time a vivid sense of the local and parochial experience of Englishmen in the disordered church system of those throbbing times. It is a great merit of the work that its eye is single for the facts and that the exposition proceeds without any mixture of polemic view, without any heat of praise or blame. The author's complete knowledge and comprehending sympathy enable him to hold and convey a discriminating and temperate view of many matters, like the condition of the mendicant orders, popular notions as to which have been formed on *ex parte* and satirical accounts. Nevertheless the whole narrative yields to the reader the argument which we call the logic of events. We see the irresistible movement of English life to a reform of intolerable conditions, to the ideals of Colet and More and to the drastic measures of Henry VIII. The book is of special value to the student of church history who knows in too isolated fashion the Statutes of Provisors and *Praemunire* and the story of Wycliffe and the Lollards. Capes furnishes the ample and definite detail which is the setting of these episodes in a long prelude of preparation for the sixteenth century crisis. Particular gratitude is due for the delightful and intimate acquaintance afforded with the influence of the church on social life and its incidence upon the ordinary life of the laity. The justice and accuracy of this excellent

book leave little occasion for dissent but the author is apparently in error in failing to credit high intellectual aims to the founder of the Dominican order and he is surely misled by Walsingham in attributing to the rioting peasants of Wycliffe's time a fanatic love of illiteracy.

It may be noted that all these volumes pay attention to the architectural development, but in terms too technical for most readers.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

The Moriscos of Spain: Their Conversion and Expulsion. By HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D. (Philadelphia: Lea Brothers and Co. 1901. Pp. xii, 463.)

MR. LEA has done well to make the history of the baptized Moors, the Moriscos, the subject of a separate book. For the first time this episode, full of dramatic situations and richly illustrative of the Spanish character and governmental methods of the time, is here clearly set forth in English in all its aspects. The task of the historian is to show how it came about that the Spanish government finally resolved on the expulsion of the Moors—perhaps the unwise thing that Spain ever did. In the early days of the struggle between the Spaniards and the Moslems toleration was the rule in the Peninsula. The Arab conquerors were lenient toward the Christians, allowing them the free exercise of their religion and a certain measure of self-government on condition of the payment of tribute and obedience to the civil authorities. As time went on Christians and Moors were mingled over a great part of the land, and the relations of the growing Christian states of the north with their Moslem neighbors were controlled by political considerations without regard to the difference of religious faith. In the same army were often found contingents from both peoples; the Cid fought indifferently on either side; in some places under Christian control the Moors formed a considerable part of the population. As early as the thirteenth century, however, this state of things began to be looked on with suspicion. The ecclesiastical authorities could not view with calmness the spectacle of a population of heathen in the midst of a Christian community—their presence, it was felt, was a contamination and a menace—it was resolved that they must be Christianized or expelled. This resolution took definite shape soon after the conquest of Granada in 1492, and culminated in the final expulsion of the Moors in 1614. How the antagonism of races was supplemented by constantly growing religious fanaticism—how violated promises drove the Moors to desperation—how the situation became so complicated that Spanish statesmanship could see no remedy but expulsion—this is what Mr. Lea undertakes to set forth. In a series of chapters he describes the condition of the Moors at the end of the fifteenth century, the attempts at their conversion by royal edicts and missionaries, the policy and methods of the Inquisition, the frightful oppres-

sion to which the Moors, baptized and unbaptized, were subjected, the attitude of the nobles, the kings, the priests and the popes, and finally the decree of expulsion and the fortunes of the exiles. His materials have been drawn partly from the published researches of Spanish scholars, partly from unedited sources in Spanish archives, and partly from his own large collection relating to the Inquisition. He is thus able to give a substantially complete history of the course of events; and it need not be said that he writes calmly and in a spirit of fairness.

It is not easy for a writer of the present day to form an unbiased opinion of the Spanish Inquisition; after one has recognized the universal intolerance of the age and the special element of race-antagonism in Spain, it is still difficult to draw the line between religion and revenge, greed and godliness, statecraft and selfish ambition. This delicate distinction Mr. Lea has succeeded reasonably well in making. He does justice to the apostolic love and wisdom of such men as Talavera, to the genuine desire of certain priests and popes to instruct the Moors in the Christian faith, and to the efforts of nobles and sovereigns to secure to them their rights. He sees the seriousness of the problem as it presented itself to the government in the sixteenth century. On the other hand he exposes the avarice, ignorance and cruelty that so largely controlled the policies of State and Church, and dwells on the amazing economic blindness that deprived Spain of what was in some respects the best part of her population. He gives a vivid picture of the industrial importance of the Moors: most of the great industries were in their hands—the Spaniards devoted themselves preferably to war, politics and the church. The number of priests was enormous, and many of them were far from contributing to the peace and progress of society; the Inquisition, an imperium in imperio, was a terror. Such a society contained the seeds of its own decay; Mr. Lea dates the beginning of the decadence of Spain from the expulsion of the Moors. It is not a part of his purpose in this book to discuss the question of Spain's downfall; such an inquiry would have taken him back to the Visigothic period, in which are found certain of the traits that are prominent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. One would, however, like to see, as a supplement to Mr. Lea's admirable narrative, a fuller account of the development of that religious bigotry which played so large a part in the final catastrophe. It may be noted, in passing, that the Spanish policy affords a certain justification for the spoliations of the Barbary corsairs. Mr. Lea's characterizations of prominent persons are well-considered and often felicitous; we may refer especially to his paragraphs on Ximenes and Philip II. His judgments of the books of the time are generally calm; he is roused to a not unnatural indignation in speaking of Bleda's *Defensio Fidei* which urged the massacre of the Moors as the most pious and effective way of dealing with the social problem. Mr. Lea's volume is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of the time treated of, and suggests general principles of government that are applicable to the present time.

C. H. TOY.

Huldreich Zwingli, the Reformer of German Switzerland. By SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON. [Heroes of the Reformation Series.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xxvi, 519.)

Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli. Edited by SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1901. Pp. 258.)

IN these two volumes Professor Jackson has made a noteworthy contribution to the material readily available for the study of the Swiss Reformation; a contribution the more to be welcomed from the fact that it does not merely consist of the conclusions of a single investigator, however scholarly and well-informed, but affords as well a large and comprehensive group of documents, bearing upon the life and work of Huldreich Zwingli, bringing the reader into a closer and more sympathetic contact with Swiss affairs, and enabling him in many particulars to corroborate or criticise the conclusions of the author and editor. As a brief and relatively complete presentation of the facts in the life of the Swiss reformer, Professor Jackson's books are much to be commended, and may well serve as a guide for future makers of books of a similarly popular but substantial character. Such books go far toward satisfying the demands of the student of general history, and it is to be hoped that the omnivorous reading public has already so far yielded to the fascination of original documents, that these have come to be, in literary matters, an indispensable addition to a suitable bill of fare.

Another feature of the book which merits attention is the excellent introduction by Professor Vincent. It may not be unusual to preface a biography with a general description of the subject's environment; but it was a particularly happy thought to select for this collaboration a scholar whose attention has been so largely centered upon this field. Nor is the result otherwise than was to be expected. The "Historical Survey of Switzerland at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century" is an admirable piece of condensation. It brings the reader into close relation with German life in that evasive period, the chief difficulty of which seems to be that it is made up of the ends and the beginnings of two abutting epochs. The introduction gives assurance of a wide and thorough knowledge of the subject, even with the results condensed into a half century of pages, and clears the way for the entrance of the hero.

Of the 800 pages which the two volumes contain, not less than half is devoted to the presentation of source material, of which one hundred pages are appended to the biography itself. The biography covers more than three hundred pages. It is written with fairness and with a knowledge of the facts, and will be read with interest and profit. For the general reader the biography will no doubt be the best esteemed portion of Professor Jackson's present work; but for the student, for whom Zwingli has become something more than a name, it will be less important. This is due to no intrinsic fault in the biography itself, but to the fact that the original documents are so well selected and prepared.

With the possible exception of Professor Emerton's *Erasmus*, the *Zwingli* is altogether the best biography the series has yet produced. Other contributors have labored, it may be, with the difficulty of finding new spots of fertility in fields of ancient tillage. In the case of the *Erasmus*, the author's necessity of forcing his "Hero" to pose with his least attractive side toward the audience was confessedly a limitation.

Professor Jackson's personal estimate of Zwingli, given in the preface, is of interest as giving evidence of the spirit with which the writer has undertaken his task. He says: "Whether he was right in his theology the author does not here discuss; nor is he at all concerned to expound and defend his distinctive teachings. But he believes that if the four great continental reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli and Calvin, should appear to-day, the one among them who would have to do least to adapt himself to our modern way of thought . . . would be Huldreich Zwingli."

The doctrinal side of Zwingli's work is, however, not neglected. In a supplementary chapter Professor Foster has contributed a discussion of Zwingli's theology, philosophy and ethics. Here the average reader, whose education in the technique of theology has been, for some unpardonable reason, neglected, may find himself in no small danger of losing his foothold. He will be surprised as well to note the meager attention given to Zwingli's characteristic view of the eucharist, a view which, from the fact that in the course of time it has come to gain ground against the attempts of Luther and Calvin to find a resting place between the dictum of the church and the exigencies of literal interpretation, serves more than any other part of Zwingli's theology to justify Professor Jackson's conclusions as to the modernism of the Zwinglian spirit.

Turning to the selections from Zwingli's works, which make up a considerable part of *Zwingli* and the whole of the *Selections*, the student will be pleased to find a translation in full of Zwingli's refutation of the doctrines and practice of the Katabaptists. He will here be enabled to pursue his inquiries, although not, it is true, under sympathetic guidance, into the nature of that peculiar product of the spiritual revolt of the fifteenth century, which, in its various phases, drew down upon itself from the reformers a measure of bitterness, beside which the mutual antagonism of Catholic and Protestant seems mild indeed.

The entire series of the "Heroes of the Reformation" has shown, so far, evidences of care and good taste in those external particulars which go to the making of attractive and legible books. The illustrations have been selected from contemporaneous material, in accordance with a generally accepted canon of historical publication. The author of *Zwingli* has departed more widely than his predecessors from this rule by introducing photographic views of buildings and other objects associated with Zwingli's career. The experiment is not wholly successful. The unity of the book is marred with the intrusion of gas-lamps and tram-cars and other untimely objects in the foreground of the pictures. In the case of a book constructed with less harmony of details, this fault might pass unnoticed.

MERRICK WHITCOMB.

Jean Calvin : les Hommes et les Choses de son Temps. Par E. DOUMERGUE, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie de Montauban. Tome I., La Jeunesse de Calvin. (Lausanne : Georges Bridel et Cie. 1899. Pp. ix, 634.)

WHEN a biography is prepared, two conditions should be fulfilled, if we are to have a definitive work which will be considered an authority in the great trial in which writers undertake to bring to the bar of history those who have helped to make history. In the first place whoever the man may be whose life is under investigation, at least the greater part of the documents ought to be attainable by the reader; and secondly, the investigation ought to be carried on in a country and at a time in which one can be free from prejudice of any sort, in order that the work may be done with the calm impartiality which lapse of time alone can bring.

The first of these conditions is undoubtedly realized in the case of Calvin. The fullest evidence that any biographer could desire is contained in the edition, now complete, of the *Opera Calvini* composed of nearly sixty volumes, more than ten of which contain letters, prolegomena and annals, and in the standard publication enriched with notes, references and appendices, *Correspondance des Réformateurs en pays de langue française*, which the late A.-L. Herminjard gathered and gave out as far back as 1545. Moreover the author of *Jean Calvin : les Hommes et les Choses de son Temps* is fully qualified to appreciate the usefulness of such material. Unfortunately it is impossible to take a view equally favorable of the second condition, the surroundings in which the biographer is placed in the preparation of his work. Intellectual France is to-day more than ever divided into two camps, if not by the very name of Calvin at least by the struggle against Rome; and the splendid volume which I have undertaken to review for the readers of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW and which is the work of one of the most eminent and popular of the French Protestants, Professor Doumergue of the theological faculty of Montauban had to be published not in Paris, the only center of the French book trade, but at Lausanne, in a country of refuge for Huguenots. Here is a characteristic fact which must not be lost sight of, if we wish to understand the book, and to judge it ourselves in all fairness.

M. Doumergue has entered upon his task with the noble ambition of giving us, not only the definitive biography of Calvin, but an exhaustive study of the men and institutions of Calvin's times. I must, with reference to this matter, quote his text *in extenso*, since this conception of his work, or rather the particular method of work which he has evolved from it, is the ground of the severest criticism so far made upon his book.

"Un homme ne vit, de toute sa vie, par conséquent de sa vraie vie, que plongé dans son milieu social, comme le poisson ne vit que dans l'eau, et l'oiseau dans l'air. Or précisément mon but est de reconstituer la vie si ignorée, si méconnue, si dénaturée de Calvin, de ce Calvin qu'on déclare être une abstraction faite homme. Pour constater sa vie, pour la sentir dans son exacte réalité, en même temps que pour la comprendre et la juger dans sa vérité vraie, j'ai pensé qu'il fallait, autant que possible,

la vivre à mon tour, et essayer de la faire vivre à mes lecteurs, c'est-à-dire la replacer et nous replacer nous-mêmes dans son milieu, dans les milieux successifs où elle s'est formée et développée. Anciennes gravures, vieux plans, quartiers de villes, maisons encore debout depuis des siècles, portraits des hommes, amis ou ennemis, qu'il prit pour maîtres ou qu'il combattit avec ardeur, autographes où se révèlent tant de sentiments, vieux livres restés intacts depuis le jour où ils sont sortis de la rue St. Jacques ou de Genève, j'allais dire : air que respiraient les habitants de l'Université de Paris, ou les étudiants de Bourges, d'Orléans, tout cela fait un tout indivisible ; tout cela, ensemble et non séparé, constitue la vie des esprits, la vie des cœurs, presque des corps et des choses au temps de Calvin, la vie de Calvin." (p. viii.)

This plan is excellent, and no historian will object to it, provided it is carried out with Calvin-like sobriety in its development, with simple austerity of method. The vastness and the complexity of the subject make such qualities indispensable.

M. Doumergue divides his first volume into five books devoted respectively to the family, the years of study, the conversion, the journeys in France, and finally the flight of the future reformer of Geneva up to the time of the publication of the *Institutio Christiana* at Bâle in 1536. In the course of this biography, in obedience to the plan which he has marked out for himself, the writer describes in turn Noyon, Orléans, Bourges, Paris, Angoulême, Nérac, Poitiers, Bâle, with their institutions, their buildings, and their inhabitants as they appeared in the sixteenth century; all with a wealth of detail, with many references and illustrations denoting a vast erudition both of the scholar and the artist. The Professor of Montauban is quite as clever a writer as he is a speaker; while he is an orator of first rank he also writes very well and his book, voluminous as it is, is one of those which we read without counting the passing hours.

Unfortunately Professor Doumergue is working in the midst of a struggle in which he is one of the most resolute champions and, under such circumstances, it may be expected that the orator will at times dominate the historian in his work as a biographer. Fluency is a desirable quality in an orator; it is not always so in the writer of a biography. The desire of being absolutely complete, of utilizing all the results of his research often induces M. Doumergue to be, so to speak, too complete. His volume on Calvin's youth is naturally limited by the dates 1509 and 1536. His references, however, in their notices of men and occurrences, cover the history of nearly the whole of the sixteenth century, events being mentioned which took place even after the death of Calvin. For instance the chapter on Protestant Paris leads us to the massacre of St. Bartholomew and has as a sub-heading the dates 1509-1572. M. Rodolphe Reuss, a competent critic, called the author's attention to the fact, that if he wished to preserve in the rest of his work the proportions thus given to the beginning, he would require for the years of Calvin's creative activity, not four more volumes, as he expects, but about ten.¹

¹ "Une nouvelle biographie de Calvin," *Bulletin historique et littéraire de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, XI.VIII, 541, et seq.

This superabundance of detail evidently threatens the artistic and literary balance of the whole. This defect is all the more serious because it is also of a scientific character. It obliges the author to describe too often in anticipation, and in some secondary parts of his work to accept facts and use terms which he will be forced to give up later, when, in pursuing the study of his main subject, he shall have reached that epoch which he has treated provisionally, so to speak, in reliance on secondary evidence, and when he shall have come to know more thoroughly the details of that particular period. More than one instance of such inaccuracy of detail might be given, to which this method of work exposes the author. The space at my disposal will allow me to cite only the following example. At the end of the interesting pages which he devotes to Mathurin Cordier, the Rollin of the sixteenth century, who was the revered master of Calvin and died a humble teacher of the fifth class in the college of Geneva, we read the following lines:

"Il fit une dernière fois sa classe. Trois jours après, il plut à Dieu 'de l'appeler de ce monde et l'alloger en repos qu'il a préparé à tous ses fidèles' [Calvin had died scarcely four months before] et l'on écrivit sur les registres de la Vénérable Compagnie: 'Le Vendredi 28 Sept. 1564, mourut le bon homme Corderius, en grand âge, heureusement et ayant servi jusques à la fin, en sa vocation d'enseigner les enfants et conduire la jeunesse, en toute sincérité, simplicité et diligence, selon la mesure qu'il avait reçue du Seigneur.'" (p. 68.)

With the exception of the date "28 Sept.," which is a misprint for "8 Sept.," the text, copied from the archives of the *Compagnie des Pasteurs* by Bétant, is here given correctly, but the expression: "on écrivit sur les registres de la Vénérable Compagnie" is not correct, properly speaking. When he turns his attention more especially to Geneva and the year in which Calvin died, Professor Doumergue will be convinced that it is better not to mention, when speaking of that time, either *registres* or *Vénérable Compagnie*. One of the ministers—in 1564 it was Nicolas Colladon—used to jot down at random the events and discussions which he thought worthy of being remembered. These scattered notes were later gathered together, forming at first a kind of *livre de raison*, then much later a *registre* of proceedings. As to the title *Vénérable Compagnie*, it appears as such only in the seventeenth century.

Professor Doumergue refutes, one by one, all the inaccuracies and the slanders, great as well as small, which have passed current among some writers concerning the youth of his hero, and he has performed his work in such a way that henceforth only ignorance or unfairness can explain a repetition of them. On this subject, as on many others, he profits by the fine work of M. Abel Lefranc, the learned secretary of the Collège de France¹; one may add that he completes it. But he is not satisfied with that. M. Lefranc showed by excellent proof that Calvin's character, at the time he considers him, is not at all such as people had believed. He reveals to us a Calvin altogether too much forgotten, who was affec-

¹ *La Jeunesse de Calvin*, Paris, 1888.

tionate, refined, beloved by everyone, sought after, and charming all who came in contact with him. M. Doumergue claims that this Calvin is not only the Calvin of twenty, but also, and without variation, the Calvin of mature years, and when M. Lefranc states that Calvin in 1532 allows himself to fall into a fit of ill humor, using the words "*s'agrit*," the Professor of Montauban reproaches him for not having understood the "*susceptibilité affectueuse*" of such a character, for not having entirely freed himself from the prejudices of legend (p. 200).

To make Calvin better known—declares M. Doumergue at the end of his preface—will result in increasing, not only the respect but also the sympathy we must feel for a great man and a great believer. I fear that if he is bent upon putting the accent on "sympathy," the cause of truth which he wishes to help by his book will not allow him to accomplish his task. When he shall have travelled over the whole course of Calvin's happy years of youth and health and when he shall have recalled the gloomy and great epoch when a church and a republic were arising in the fiery furnace, forged, as Michelet says, on the rock of predestination, then he will find no longer on his way the smiling and beloved countenance. His hero will grow strangely. He will command, I am sure, universal respect, but the historians who have studied him most closely have not brought back from their study, a sympathetic feeling as far as his person is concerned. They could no longer feel his heart beat. M. Doumergue appeals from an almost unanimous judgment. Before deciding definitely, it is just to wait for his own account of facts, but we must wish in the interests of historical truth that he will pay more attention to investigating than to pleading the case.

In spite of the objections which the work provokes and of the criticisms that must be made, the latest biography of Calvin is certainly an epoch-making book. I have given only a poor idea of its contents; the appendices alone—fifteen learned studies devoted to the discussion of special questions, and of which I have not been able to speak—would deserve the whole space allotted to this article. One may say that this work is a treasury of scholarly interest which should be found on the shelves of every library; and a part of the honor of bringing out such a book must redound to the credit of the country where it was published and to the credit of the publishers, MM. Georges Bridel et Cie, who have made every sacrifice to make it a masterpiece of typographic art. All the capital letters of the headings of chapters are facsimile reproductions of those of Robert Estienne; another volume will reproduce the letters of Badius; a third, those of Gérard. The tail-pieces are formed from the typographic marks or emblems of the great Huguenot printers. In every respect this book is a monument. It will certainly produce other works; and if it raises contradiction now and then, any criticism must needs be full of respect for the sincere, painstaking, and powerful work of the author.

CHARLES BORGEAUD.

The Love of an Uncrowned Queen (Sophie Dorothea, consort of George I., and her correspondence with Philip Christopher Count Königsmarck, now first published from the originals). By W. H. WILKINS, M.A. (Chicago and New York: Herbert S. Stone and Co. 1901. Pp. x, 578.)

THE author deals with a mystery that has aroused interest in each successive generation since 1694 and that the smooth narrative before us would appear to have solved—if only the author's statements could be believed. But there are serious charges to be brought against Mr. Wilkins's book in spite of the fact that it shows much labor and ingenuity, that the author is a fellow of the Royal Historical Society, and that he claims to have brought forward new and conclusive evidence. Firstly the use of the literature has been incomplete and the most important work that has yet appeared, Horric de Beaucaire's *Mésalliance dans la Maison de Brunswick* (Paris 1884), has been overlooked, as have also the publications from the Prussian archives containing letters to and from the Electress Sophia. Secondly the use of authorities has been uncritical to the last degree; for instance among the works cited are Köcher's essays on the *Prinzessin von Ahlden* which appeared in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 48. Now if there is one episode on which Köcher has dwelt with peculiar emphasis it is that of the supposed visit of the Electress Sophia to the court of Celle to ask for the hand of Sophie Dorothea for the Electoral Prince. Köcher shows that the whole incident is a figment of the imagination of Duke Anthony Ulrich of Wolfenbüttel whose choice of the doings at Hanover for the theme of the sixth volume of his novel, *Die Römische Octavia*, is responsible for the erroneous views of later historians. Without an attempt to refute Köcher, Wilkins adopts the whole dramatic narrative of the visit; in another connection, and also without giving his reasons, he calls Anthony Ulrich's romance "a fairly true version of the princess's story" while acknowledging that its form tells against accuracy. As a matter of fact letters of Anthony Ulrich published by Beaucaire in the appendix of his work show that, at the time at least of the arrest of the princess and the disappearance of Königsmarck, the duke was kept as much in the dark as was the rest of the wondering world.

The bulk of Wilkins's book is made up of a supposed correspondence between Königsmarck and Sophie Dorothea; the letters are preserved in the University of Lund and their ownership can be traced back through several generations to a relative of Count Königsmarck. Schaumann, the first critical writer on this whole subject, and Köcher, who has published all the available material from the Hanoverian archives, as well as Horric de Beaucaire, condemn the correspondence as utterly spurious; Wilkins disposes of Schaumann and Köcher by the simple declaration that they have never seen the originals—but Beaucaire has seen them and is as unhesitating as the other two. He has compared the handwriting with that of genuine letters of the two persons concerned and finds no

resemblance. And indeed had these letters ever actually passed between a nobleman and the wife of the Prince in whose army he was serving, what in the world would have induced the guilty pair to preserve them, to deposit them, as Wilkins surmises, "at stated periods, probably at the end of every six months," in the hands of the infamous Aurora Königs-marck? They are of no importance to history save as proving that the connection of the two was highly improper. Would a princess be likely to hand over to a third party letters to herself so indecent that Wilkins has had to expurgate them?

The strongest point brought forward by Wilkins is that the despatches of Sir William Dutton Colt, British envoy from 1689 to 1693, now produced for the first time, corroborate the correspondence in certain ways: "if it can be proved," he writes, "by independent testimony and 'undesigned coincidences' (as Paley would say) that the mention of persons are accurate and the allusions to even minute events correct in every detail, it affords the strongest possible proof of the genuineness and authenticity of the letters." But the "minute events" as given in Wilkins's extracts from Colt prove to be almost wholly the coming of this or that person to this or that place at such and such a time. Now mark what a powerful weapon is placed in the hands of an editor who would like to have these two accounts agree. Wilkins says himself that throughout the correspondence an elaborate cypher or rather series of cyphers has been used for the names of persons and places and that the task of unravelling has been so difficult he must ask for indulgence if errors have crept in—furthermore that only four out of 200 letters are dated and that he has been obliged to sort them so as "to allow them to answer one another in due order." With such power over names and dates almost any two texts could be made to conform!

Perhaps the caliber of Wilkins's book can best be judged from the following passages occurring in a chapter on the "History and Authenticity of the Letters," which as a note implies can be skipped by the ordinary reader as it "does not affect the narrative": "Two centuries have gone; the lovers are dead; the hands that penned these burning words, the eyes that wept, the hearts that throbbed as they were written have crumbled into dust. But their witness is here—here in these old and faded pages, which breathe even now, faint as the scent of dead rose leaves, the perfume of their passion."

ERNEST F. HENDERSON.

L'Œuvre Sociale de la Révolution Française. Introduction par M. ÉMILE FAGUET. (Paris: Librairie A. Fontemoing. Pp. 460.)

THIS volume of essays upon the social changes brought about by the French Revolution should contribute not a little towards a better appreciation of the great non-political revolution which is so commonly obscured by the dramatic political history of the time. It is not always made clear that the deep and permanent change which trans-

formed the society of feudal France into that of the France of to-day was the real French Revolution, in which the Terror, the Directorate and the Empire were but passing incidents. The volume under review traces in a series of short clear summaries how the change came about, and how it affected the common people, the clergy, the army, and the soil of France. The summaries, while popular in style, are by specialists, to whose larger works the reader is referred for fuller treatment from this point of view. M. Faguet's introduction "*Sur les Idées maitresses de la Révolution française*" gives unity to the volume by showing how the various Revolutionary principles were at bottom but different phases of one dominating idea, that of equality. Liberty, as understood at the beginning of the Revolution, meant rather the suppression of privilege in society than the overthrow of monarchy, and as fraternity is only "equality considered as a sentiment or passion," the famous motto of the Revolution may be reduced to its first term. In application we see this idea of equality at the basis of every reform. Common and free education is demanded that the qualifications of wealth may be neutralized. To make "equality before the law" a reality, the advantages of wealth itself must be more equally distributed, and, in the redistribution of property which resulted, the Revolution was unconsciously verging towards socialistic ground. The new bourgeois already satisfied with the profits of the equalizing process checked this tendency when it came to light in Babeuf. M. Faguet in his attempt to emphasize the main source of the Revolutionary ideas has perhaps overstated his case, but his treatment is thoughtful and suggestive. He closes however with applications to the present conditions in France, which are dragged in somewhat unnecessarily and obscure the general plan of the book in an unfortunate manner.

The question how far this idea of equality was consciously worked out in the Revolution is discussed in the second essay by M. Lichtenberger on "*Le socialisme et la Révolution française*," which is an admirable study of the various attacks upon the property of the privileged orders. It was the exigencies of the hour that brought the general overturn rather than philosophic theories, and the point is well made that it was the very paternalism of the old régime, with its minute interference in private affairs, which afforded the precedent for the confiscation of property when the owners refused their service to the state. The Revolution was in no way socialistic in principle.

The third essay, "*Les Doctrines de l'Éducation révolutionnaire*," by Maurice Wolff discusses at considerable length the genesis of the public school system in France with special elaboration of the work of Condorcet. The treatment of the subject is somewhat detailed and will be of more interest to French readers than to foreigners unless conversant with the present system in France.

M. Sagnac's contribution on "*La propriété foncière et les paysans pendant la Révolution*," is a good survey of a most intricate subject. Passing hurriedly over the conditions to 1789 the author reviews the work of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies in a masterly fashion. The

"brigands" are explained in a word; the pressure of the nation on a vacillating legislature which slowly yielded, point by point, is well brought out. After an analysis of the *maximum*, and the prohibition of export under the new system, the essay closes with a short résumé.

The fourth essay in the book "*La Révolution et le clergé catholique*," by M. L. Cahen is quite as satisfactory as the third, and following the same plan gives a succinct account of the action of the lower clergy from the elections of 1789 throughout the Revolution, bringing out clearly as well the influence of the civil constitution upon the fall of the monarchy and the disaffection that brought the Terror. M. Cahen has the gift of epigram and his statements must sometimes be taken with reserve, but his study is a valuable summary of a phase of the Revolution the importance of which is not always understood.

M. Levy Schneider closes the series by a similar account of the changes which the Revolution caused in the army. The application of republican principles there, causing the demoralization of the army of the old régime and the inefficiency of the central government, leading to obedience to local authorities, are sketched hurriedly, and the main interest is centered upon the work of the Convention. The situation during the Terror and the effect of the 9th of Thermidor are well described.

Altogether the collection, while perhaps not always convincing, is a most welcome contribution to the literature of the Revolution, both for its point of view, and its clearness in presentation. It is to be regretted, however, that M. Faguet did not at the beginning more clearly define the field covered by the book and make clear its significance, instead of somewhat obscuring the subject by applications that link it to the politics of the present.

JAMES T. SHOTWELL.

Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871. VON ALFRED STERN. Dritter Band. (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz. 1901. Pp. xii, 419.)

It is four years since the second volume of Dr. Stern's history of Europe appeared and now the third volume, carrying the narrative to 1830, has come to hand. Thus at intervals of from three to four years the author is presenting the results of his researches, gradually increasing the number of volumes of a history that for many years is bound to be the most authoritative work upon the subject. He seems to have mapped out his plan on the basis of five year periods, and if the present rate of progress is maintained and the five year periods adhered to, the entire work will be finished in about thirty years, a long time, indeed, for any scholar to count on for continuous and uninterrupted labor. When completed the work will stand as the only history of the nineteenth century based strictly on original investigation and will seem to furnish an answer in part at least to the despairing cry of Seignobos and Alison Phillips that "a hundred lives of mortal men," to use the expression of the last-

named, "would not suffice for the collation and comparison of the stupendous mass of documents." Dr. Stern is giving to the world a scientific history and there is no special reason to believe that the facts here presented will need to be seriously altered as the result of a further and fuller examination of the archives. That such examination will continually add new evidence and will modify in many particulars statements here made is inevitable, but even such an eventuality does not preclude the writing of a scientific history at the present time, unless the rigid canons laid down by Seignobos in *Introduction aux Études Historiques* are to be adhered to as furnishing the only possible definition of scientific history. The latter has stated that it is "materially impossible to write a contemporaneous history of Europe in conformity with the scientific method" (Preface to *Histoire Politique de l'Europe Contemporaine*). If by that he means that no statement must be made "sans une note qui en fasse connaître l'origine précise et permette d'apprécier la valeur des documents d'où elle sort"¹ then he is probably right and no man should presume to deal with any subject that he cannot cover in this searching fashion. Aulard's *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française*, which is M. Seignobos's ideal history, would seem then to represent the limit of human endeavor and, having occupied M. Aulard for fifteen years, to show the futility of attempting to write critically a general history of any kind. Such criticism is, however, unjust and as coming from one who has been a compiler and text-book writer the greater part of his life and has not produced himself any important original work of a scientific character cannot be credited as having great practical value. The faculty of writing impartially and objectively, of selecting approved documentary evidence, and of using critically the work of others, in any field, large or small, is as important a part of scientific historical writing as is the criticism of the documents themselves. In this sense the work of Stern is as scientific as that of Aulard.

Dr. Stern begins his account with a description of the internal condition of Russia under Alexander I. This is significant in that the only serious criticism that has been brought against this work has concerned its neglect of internal history and the undue prominence given to minor details of foreign relations. In this respect the volume before us shows marked improvement and the internal affairs of Russia, England and France are here discussed as they ought to be without regard to their bearing on the foreign policy. Dr. Stern's description of Russia is of interest to the student not only of history but of economic development also. The author shows that an independent bourgeois and capitalist class was at the very beginning of its formation, that city life, in the modern sense, hardly existed at all, that industry was in the domestic stage and agriculture everywhere the dominant interest. He shows that the administrative system was more highly centralized than to-day and more corrupt, that the land-owning classes were supreme and the peas-

¹ From Seignobos's review of Aulard in *Revue Universitaire*, May 15, 1901.

ants unfree, and that in manufactures and commerce the country was wholly dependent on the outside world. From this stage in her economic history we know that Russia is to-day emerging, and that an industrial revolution is making her independent of her neighbors in industry as well as in agriculture and even threatening the autocratic system itself. The demand for a constitution, which has been made twice already, is bound to be made again, and the student who wishes to understand why this is likely and to know the full significance of the work that M. Witte is attempting to accomplish is recommended to read the first eighty-one pages of this book.

From the internal history of Russia, Dr. Stern passes to her external policy and plunges at once into the complications of the Greek war of independence. To our knowledge of the diplomacy of this period he has been able to make noteworthy additions, and there is scarcely a phase of the negotiations among the powers that he has not enlarged upon and illumined. With the single exception of Fédor von Demelitsch (*Metternich und seine Auswärtige Politik*, Vol. I., 1898), there is no writer that has hitherto attempted to study, in its entirety, the policy of Metternich, or to draw his information from other sources than those of a single state. Demelitsch has not yet, however, reached the period that we are examining, so that Stern's account of the negotiations leading to the overthrow of the Holy Alliance and the signing of the treaty of London is the first adequate analysis that has yet been made of Metternich's many and vain attempts to recover his influence, either by mediation, armed interference, a quadruple alliance of Austria, England, Prussia and France, a congress, or, after the treaty of Adrianople, by the revival of the Holy Alliance. Scarcely a word of this secret diplomatic campaign will be found in any of the more accessible histories by Flathe, Bulle, Fyffe, Debidour, or latest of all, Alison Phillips. As Demelitsch continually throws discredit on Metternich's *Memoirs*, wherever he has occasion to test them, so Stern has shown that Metternich deliberately deceived the Russian ambassador, who had charged him with this diplomatic scheming, when he declared in a well-known interview that such assertions were false and such errors were insulting (*Memoirs*, IV. Sect. 941). Dr. Stern has been equally successful in throwing light upon the history of the Carlist and Miguelist movements in Spain and Portugal, though no such far-reaching errors have been corrected as was the case in the second volume. For an example of the thoroughness with which Dr. Stern works and for an excellent instance of the documentary evidence that lies behind his conclusions the reader should turn to his article in the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* (1900, Heft I. pp. 49-77), "Der 'Grosse Plan' Polignacs," the thirty pages of which are in the volume before us compressed into a page and a half and all references to the sources omitted.

I have no space here to discuss the author's treatment of the other countries whose history he has written. After bringing his narrative of foreign affairs to the year 1830, he turns to the internal history of Prus-

sia and the lesser German states, then to Spain and Portugal, then to England, where he follows events through the agitation for Catholic emancipation, Irish reforms, and the beginnings of agitation for electoral reform, to the death of George IV. and the close of the Parliamentary session of 1830, and finally to France through the reign of Charles X. to the signing of the ordinances of July. In the latter instance, notwithstanding the elaborate work done by Viel-Castel, Nettetment and Duvergier de Hauranne, Stern has been able to correct many errors and to fill out many accounts with the aid of memoirs unknown to these writers, of documents from the Paris and London archives, and especially of the reports of Apponyi preserved in the archives of Vienna. An excellent instance of the value of this new material may be found in connection with the Algerian undertaking on page 376.

One word in conclusion may be said regarding what will be deemed the most important aspect, scientifically speaking, of this work. All other writers, who have discussed the diplomacy of the European governments during this period, such as Beer for Austria, Viel-Castel for France, Ringhoffer for Prussia, have studied the documents of their own particular states and have presented the subject from a peculiarly national point of view. Stern, on the other hand, like Demelitsch, has limited himself to the documents of no particular government. He has gathered his material from the archives of London, Vienna, Paris, Berlin, Frankfurt-on-the-Main, and the Hague, and has made use of Martens's collection of treaties from the archives of the Russian Foreign Office. Thus his vantage-point is always European not national, and he never becomes a special pleader for the diplomacy of any special government or group of statesmen, as is, for example, Ringhoffer in his recent work on Prussia's foreign policy from 1820 to 1830. Perhaps most interesting of all is the fact that Dr. Stern has been allowed access, at last, to the masses of documents in the Public Record Office, London, the use of which was denied to Fyffe by Lord Granville, when the former was writing his history in the decade from 1880 to 1890. The permission thus accorded is to be extended to such documents as Dr. Stern may need for his next volume, which will carry the subject presumably to the year 1835.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Essai d'une Psychologie politique du Peuple Anglais au XIX^e Siècle,
Par ÉMILE BOUTMY. (Paris : Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. viii,
456.)

ADMIRERS of M. Boutmy will be disappointed in this work, for although there is much in it that is interesting, the theme is, on the whole less well thought out, and the argument is less cogent, than in his other books. There is, moreover, some tendency to exaggeration, or at least to the laying of undue stress on certain traits of national character.

The book is divided into five parts. The first of these is an attempt to explain the mental and moral characteristics of the English by the

climate of their country and the products of its soil. The dampness and darkness of the weather, as the author tells us, necessitate hard work for the preservation of life while the absence of extremes of temperature, and the richness of the soil in agricultural and mineral wealth, render labor exceedingly productive; the result being a great development of energy, foresight and self-control. In fact, activity and self-restraint are, in his opinion, the most marked elements in the British character. On the other hand, the heavy moist air causes a lack of sensibility; and the dull, misty prospect, the want of a clear, luminous atmosphere, deprives the Englishman of the sharp impressions, and consequently of the lively imagination of people of more southern climes. The mind is turned inward to brood upon itself and contemplate the moral relations of things, rather than the beauties of nature. Moreover the habit of constant activity interferes with the uninterrupted state of contemplation which is needed to evolve generalizations, and hence the English dislike and distrust abstract ideas, and have a limited capacity for producing them. The author proceeds to illustrate these mental and moral attributes of Englishmen from their language, literature, art, philosophy, science and religion.

An attempt to compass a theory of such magnitude in the few words of a short review must, of course, be unjust to the author; yet it may be that enough has been said to indicate the direction of his thought.

The second Part of the book deals with the races of which the population of the British Isles is composed. It begins with the Germanic tribes, and here M. Boutmy is struck, and, in fact, astounded, by finding more or less transformed, in contemporary English civilization, each of the traits depicted by Tacitus. But, if so, what becomes of his theory that those traits are due to the physical peculiarities of the British Isles? And, in passing, the comment may be made that if the mental and moral character of the English results from a damp climate, an even temperature, and a productive soil, one of the greatest race contrasts which this world can present ought in time to be found between the inhabitants of Old and New England.

After describing the results of the incursions of different races into Great Britain, M. Boutmy goes on to portray the effects produced by the economic and social changes that have supervened; and the reader recognizes here the mode of thought that gives so much value to the author's *Développement de la Constitution et de la Société politique en Angleterre*. Strangely enough, in speaking of the agricultural England of the later Middle Ages, the "merry England of the chroniclers," he says that nothing then gave an idea of the indefatigable activity of the English of our day. The Anglo-Saxons, he adds, who bore in their veins the blood of adventurers, came into possession of an extraordinarily fertile land, and succumbed at last to the temptations of a quiet life and easy wealth. But this, again, is hardly consistent with the theory of the earlier portion of the book. He there attributed the character of modern England to the climate and the soil. He now derives it from en-

tirely different sources, namely, the discovery of America, and the religious revivals of the Puritans and of Wesley.

The last three Parts of the work, forming about two-thirds of its pages, are devoted to an examination of the political psychology of the people at the present day. In general, his estimate of Englishmen does not differ essentially from that commonly accepted in France. He finds them highly individualistic, somewhat brutal, unsociable, lacking in sympathy, and among the uneducated masses stupid; but, on the other hand, from their very lack of sympathy, frank to the degree that reaches nobility of character, energetic from the need of activity, and conservative from their dislike of abstract ideas. It may seem hard to reconcile the want of sociability with the undoubted great capacity of the English people for collective action, but the author overcomes the difficulty by ascribing the latter quality to the Englishman's pleasure in feeling himself connected with a powerful movement, a feeling which gratifies his craving for activity. It may be observed that some of the best political traits of the people are attributed ultimately to mental limitations; and in fact one derives from the book the impression that, except for this quality of energy, which partakes of the nature of virtue, the capacity of the Englishman for self-government is due rather to defects than to positive virtues.

The book goes on to treat of the political psychology of the Englishman of to-day in his various relations, as a citizen, as a party man, as a statesman. He discusses the nature of English law, and the way it is regarded by the courts and the public; the Crown and the reasons for its continued hold on the sentiment of the nation. Finally, Part V. describes the position of the individual, the family, the classes and religious sects; and ends with a couple of essays (which have already appeared in the *Annales des Sciences Politiques*) upon the functions of the state in its dealings with its own citizens, and with foreign nations.

M. Boutmy is always keen, interesting and suggestive, even when his generalizations do not carry entire conviction to the reader. But in this brief review there is room to mention only one or two of his more striking comments on English public life. One of these relates to the nature of the political parties. He notes the lack of abstract theories, or general doctrines, as the basis of party division, and the ease with which the parties change their position on questions of the day; he points out the large proportion of leading statesmen in the nineteenth century who, in the course of their public career, changed either their principles or their party. At the same time he observes the absence of independents, the fact that everyone belongs to some party, and the permanence of parties themselves. All this he explains by means of his analysis of the British political character, and especially the weakness of the power of generalization, and the necessity of a vent for activity. He sums up the whole situation in a single sentence. In substance, he says, the parties resemble much less two groups of believers who are trying to make their doctrines prevail, than two groups of combatants who are fighting

for a battle-field, and who inscribe devices on their flags in order to be recognized. This sentence touches a real and vital distinction between the parties in Anglo-Saxon and in Latin countries; and yet, of course, it is the picture of English parties drawn by a Frenchman, and, no doubt, an Englishman would express the contrast somewhat differently.

Another matter which M. Boutmy brings out very clearly is the relation of the state in England to the liberty of the individual. After pointing out the early period at which the power of the state became established in England, he describes how that state has been in the habit of leaving in the charge of individuals such matters as they were willing to attend to, whether of a public or a private nature. The line between the authority of the state and the liberty of the individual is a question not of right but of fact, and is drawn from time to time not according to abstract principles, but according to reasons of expediency. Hence, while England is the country where the action of the state is habitually the most restricted, it is the one where public motives, when brought into play, meet with the least resistance; and thus state interference with personal liberty is at times more radical and more drastic than elsewhere. This he illustrates by references to the impressment of seamen, the laws of public health, land legislation in Ireland, and other matters. He believes that the energy and activity of her people will always prevent state interference from becoming as universal in England as in France; but that if these great qualities of the English character were to become enfeebled England would be less well protected against the exaggerations of state socialism than France with her deep-rooted faith in the abstract rights of individuals.

The book, if superficial in parts, is, as a whole, interesting and suggestive; but it can hardly be regarded as a thorough systematic treatise on the subject with which it deals.

A. L. LOWELL.

Histoire de la Civilisation Contemporaine en France. Par ALFRED RAMBAUD. Sixth Edition. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. xii, 836.)

THE book, the title of which stands at the head of this review, is not, in appearance at least, a new book. It purports to be simply the sixth edition of a work first placed before the public more than twelve years ago. Between it, however, and its former editions, the differences are so numerous and of such importance that it is entitled to supersede them entirely. Not only does it contain a number of new chapters, or of additions to chapters that existed formerly, but it is safe to say that hardly any page in the work has passed from the earlier to the new edition without undergoing some change.

As it is now the work consists of three books, divided into thirty-four chapters. These thirty-four chapters contain the history of French civilization from the beginning of the French Revolution to the end of

the nineteenth century. The main division adopted by the author is based upon the great governmental changes which have taken place in France since it first determined to throw off the shackles of the *Ancien Régime*. The reader, however, who expects to find in Professor Rambaud's pages a history of the various revolutions of France during the nineteenth century will be disappointed. The work relates to politics only as one of the elements that constitute the civilization of the country. The author takes as the distinguishing features of political life in the first period, 1789-1815, revolution and reorganization; in the second, 1815-1848, government by a privileged class of voters, possessing the franchise by virtue of a property qualification; and in the third period, 1848-1900, universal suffrage.

Except for the first period, during which took place, under the master hand of Napoleon, the organization of the French administration and the French judiciary, little political information is given beside an exceedingly clear exposition of the various constitutions and a kind of tableau of the political personnel. The other chapters relate to the various manifestations of national life, such as literature, science and art, to the condition of agriculture, manufactures and trade, to the mode of life of the inhabitants, to the development of public instruction, and to the very curious relations of Church and State with each other.

The great merit of the book, which is intended specially for the higher classes in the French *lycées* and *collèges*, in other words, for young people of from fourteen to eighteen years of age, lies in its great clearness and in the vast number of well defined facts which are stated within its pages.

To the purpose for which the book was written must be ascribed, no doubt, the main fault by which it will seem to be marred to the non-French reader, namely, a certain lack of proportion in the treatment of the various elements included in the somewhat vague and very comprehensive word civilization. Literature, for instance, occupies a place decidedly smaller than its importance would warrant. Very wisely the author has given more space to the subjects about which he knew French boys and girls to be, in the usual state of things, less informed than they ought to be, questions of government, the history of sciences, etc.; on what concerns the development of the French language and the production of its masterpieces, the programme of the French schools leaves very little to be desired. Such as it is, however, the American reader will find a great deal in it that will be new to him, presented in a delightfully lucid style, and arranged in the well thought out order which is one of the chief characteristics of French books. Whether a simple translation of the book would be desirable is, to our mind, somewhat doubtful. But an adaptation, the chief effort in the preparation of which would be in the direction of expansion of the rather slighted parts of the work, would do a great deal towards making the essentials of French national life better known in this country.

ADOLPHE COHN.

Liberty Documents, with Contemporary Exposition and Critical Comments drawn from Various Writers. Selected and prepared by MABEL HILL; edited with an introduction by A. B. HART. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1901. Pp. xxviii, 458.)

SCIENTIFIC teaching demands that the student be brought into as close touch as possible with the subject-matter under discussion. In botany, for example, plants, not books, are essential. In harmony with this conception it is now an almost universally accepted principle that in historical study the pupil should be brought into direct contact with the original records of the events under consideration. Since it is ordinarily not feasible to put the student into touch with all the records of any event—to say nothing of all the records of all history—it becomes necessary to make collections of representative or typical documents or material. These collections may be prepared either to supplement the ordinary narrative text, or to take the place of the narrative itself as a class text. Nearly all the existing source collections have been prepared with the former purpose in view. Miss Hill in her *Liberty Documents* has evidently attempted the latter and more difficult problem. Her selections have been made to illustrate a single idea—the growth or evolution of constitutional history among English speaking peoples. To this end she has selected the whole, or the essential portions, of thirty-one documents arranged in twenty-five chapters. Choice has been made only of well-known and relatively easily accessible documents. The work, therefore, must be judged, not from its subject-matter, but from the idea or plan of use and arrangement. On the whole Miss Hill's examples are typical; so from this point of view it leaves little for criticism. Perhaps the limit she placed on herself by deciding to use only documents in the English language was unwise; for it cuts out all material of the French Revolutionary era. But as the line had to be drawn somewhere, it reduces itself to a matter of judgment; and after making all allowances for differences of judgment, it may still be affirmed without hesitation that the student who masters this book has a broad foundation laid for both historical research and good citizenship.

An endeavor has also been made to trace the historical evolution of the documents cited by introducing one or more contemporaneous expositions and a few extracts from the best later or modern commentators. The student thus has the document, contemporaneous exposition, and modern comment before him for each study. It is perhaps here that Miss Hill has introduced the most original feature of her work, and to a considerable extent it will be upon this feature that her book will be judged; for the brief introduction to each chapter, the marginal analyses, and the general suggestions are not essentially different from those of other works. The salient points of her plan, *viz.*, selecting a single idea or principle, and developing it by adding extracts, the writer believes to be valuable in her application of them and in their suggestiveness. It goes without saying that no final or complete study of such a

topic as Miss Hill has chosen could be made from the material given, or from any material that could be given, in the space assigned; but it is believed that the high-school boy who masters this book will have a far better, and at the same time a more comprehensive, knowledge of the evolution of constitutional liberty than he can get—or at least is likely to get—from any other book or method of study. In short, history teachers owe to Miss Hill their good-will for this study, and to the publishers their hearty thanks for the excellent mechanical execution of the volume.

HOWARD W. CALDWELL.

The Thirteen Colonies. By HELEN AINSLEE SMITH. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Two Vols., pp. xii, 442; viii, 510.)

MISS SMITH announces in her preface that "This work has been prepared with the purpose of telling 'The Story of the Thirteen Colonies' in a manner to meet the requirements rather of the general reader than of the special student." In so doing she follows the general plan of the series to which the volumes under review belong. The author has chosen the novel method of treating the colonies as thirteen distinct units each of which has a separate history from the foundation of the colony to the Declaration of Independence, the result being that, excluding the first chapter on the age of discovery, the work consists of thirteen monographs bound together in the order of the settlement of colonies. This method of writing American colonial history is based upon the supposition that the points of difference among the several colonies were more important and fundamental than those of similarity. If this had been true the present essential unity of the American people would have been, if possible at all, even more difficult of attainment than our ancestors found it. Indeed, the chief defect of the work, Miss Smith's failure to convey clear ideas of the progressive movements and forces which led logically and inevitably to the union of the colonies in the American nation, is directly traceable to this plan of treatment. To the same reason is due the failure to treat adequately the relations between the colonies and England, especially in the first half of the eighteenth century, and the events they shared in common, such as the French and the Indian wars. In general the earlier and later periods are more satisfactorily treated than the middle period, where the narrative, in common with nearly all of our colonial histories, becomes hardly more than an account of the succession of provincial governors, most of whom were of little consequence. It is perhaps hardly fair to ask of the writer of a confessedly popular work adequate consideration of American history from 1691 to 1754, a time which has been in many of its most important features so notoriously slighted by the historians of the colonial era.

Governmental and institutional development does not receive satisfactory attention, as for instance in Maryland, where the importance of the land question is not sufficiently emphasized. Generalizations, some-

times rhetorical at the expense of consistency, are not always substantiated by the facts as narrated by the author. The English style of *The Thirteen Colonies* is on the whole excellent and well adapted to the popular character of the work, although occasionally the dignity of historical narrative is marred by such expressions as "cut no figure" (Vol. I. p. 212). Errors, some of them doubtless typographical, are not infrequent, as for example: (Vol. I. p. 127) Washington is said to have been major-general of the Virginia militia in 1753; the reign of William III. is spoken of as of eight years' duration; and the ordinance of 1621 (not 1620), which was not a charter, is called the second special charter granted to the southern division of the Virginia Company. As a matter of fact the second charter granted especially to the London Company was that of 1612.

The volumes contain much interesting matter attractively arranged and entertainingly presented. Excellent judgment has been shown in apportioning space among the several colonies and in giving to events within each colony emphasis according to their relative importance. While the author has perhaps added little to our knowledge of the colonies, she has certainly written a very creditable book that cannot fail to give the general reader an increased interest in the history of our forefathers of the pre-Revolutionary days.

MARSHALL S. BROWN.

The May-Flower and her Log, July 15, 1620-May 6, 1621, chiefly from original sources. By AZEL AMES, M.D. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Pp. xxii, 375.)

THE annual inundation of oratory on forefathers' day and the constant gush of rhetoric issuing from family, church and national pride need the strong dykes of proved fact in order to preserve the solid land of history. Such a dyke the author has reared in his sumptuous work upon *The May-Flower and her Log*. One might at first wonder why Dr. Ames should be so painstaking, and so decidedly polemic over the minutiae of the famous voyage. At times he seems to be very much in earnest about breaking some butterfly writer about the Pilgrims on his ponderous wheel, and again is as in ecstasies because he has run down some tiny little heresy to the earth. At times his exultation seems akin to that of some sixteenth-century Spanish inquisitor in mashing a Dutch Calvinist into bits. The Gallios on the subject will be positively amused at Dr. Ames's earnestness in dealing with microscopic analysis of facts and publishing them according to his standard of orthodoxy. Yet the historical student must reckon this as highest virtue, thankful that he has here one who counts historical truth as valuable as that of theology or religion. Indeed truth, which needs no adjective or qualification whatever, is the goal.

After long investigations extending over many years the author lays claims to have made no fewer than twenty-three new contributions, or

original demonstrations of more or less historical importance, to the history of the Pilgrims. Among these are the establishment of dates, correct lists of passengers, vindication of persons hitherto more or less under the shadow of actual or implicit censure, such as Robert Cushman, the addition of several new names to the list of the merchant adventurers, a fuller and more trustworthy description of the "May-Flower" herself, besides many facts not hitherto published, or generally known, as to the antecedents, relationships, etc., of individual Pilgrims, of both the Leyden and the English contingents, and of certain of the merchant adventurers. He spells the name of the ship "May-Flower" according to the earliest official record, of the colony of New Plymouth, now known, in which her name appears, and he gives both the old and new styles of dates.

In elaborating his theme, the author discusses in his second chapter the Mayflower's consort, the Speedwell. In doing so, he demolishes much of the dogmatism of Professor Arber. The unseaworthiness of this pinnacle was due to a loose board or plank, and not to "overmasting." So eager is Dr. Ames to show how capable and intelligent these "nation-builders" were, that he would have us (by suggestion at least) believe that their sagacity was never found unequal to the problems they met. If he means, in his steadfast encomium and high appraisal, the leaders of Leyden, who dominated the movement on two continents and the sea, we can quite agree with him in his eloquence, yes, even join him in his denunciation of those who, by taking a different view, are in his sight marplots of the glorious Pilgrim history. If, however, he means that the rank and file of the Separatists were especially gifted in insight or foresight, and that these "inveterate landmen and townfolk" were thoroughly equipped colonists of the first order, either in preparation or in genius, then we fear that his book, at least in some parts, approaches dangerously near to the historic value of after-dinner oratory on forefathers' day. After studying the subject pretty thoroughly, we cannot find that the body of Pilgrims, aside from their deep convictions, their profound faith in God, and their stout hearts were in any way especially fitted to be colonists of America or any other wild country.

In discussing the charter, the ship herself, the officers and crew, the passengers, quarters, food and cooking and the lading, the author must necessarily, even after winnowing his mighty pile of materials, rely upon historic probabilities rather than known facts to make his story complete. We are glad to say that he seems always to have "tried to state only recorded facts or to give expression to well grounded inferences." Nevertheless, so contagious is the century-old panegyric of the Pilgrims and so persistent the exaggeration of rhetoric, that occasionally in text or note comments the author's words give an impression which simple history does not yield. In fact the author would have done better, we think, to have subjected the eulogists of the Pilgrims to even severer scrutiny than he has subjected their supposed critics, condemners, lukewarm friends, or those who would without warrant share their fame.

The statement (p. 220) that "of ' chests ' and ' chests of drawers ' there were doubtless goodly numbers in the ship," is hardly exact. It is not probable that Luther's hymn in German was known to the Leyden Separatists. If he would have us understand by "services" over the dead, anything as religious in form as in later days, even of the eighteenth century, we cannot agree with him. Neither the author's text in detail, nor the rhetoric of Choate and Goodwin quoted, gives any indication as to what a floating pest house the Mayflower was, as she lay in the harbor and then departed, and into which, what with the profane sailors and the horrible pest, no normal Pilgrim in the company would wish to return. We need not dwell on the funny geographical error in Dr. Holmes's quoted verses, nor the author's slip alleging that Carlyle was an "Englishman," nor on the grammatical error of Lowell on the title-page. Of printer's mistakes, or poor proof reading, in a work containing so many old forms and uncouth spellings, there are, to the author's credit, next to none. There is an excellent index. On the whole it must be confessed that Dr. Ames has proved most of the points which he has freshly made, while in thoroughness of discussion, and in the massing, critical use and comparison of authorities, his book is a model. The matter is fully equal to the superb form in which this noblest contribution to the subject made for a century has been clothed.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

The Life of Charles Thomson, Secretary of the Continental Congress and Translator of the Bible from the Greek. By LEWIS R. HARLEY. (Philadelphia: Jacobs and Co. 1900. Pp. 244.)

It is a somewhat remarkable fact that more than three-quarters of a century should have elapsed since the death of Charles Thomson, Secretary of the Continental Congress, before a formal biography of this sterling patriot should appear. The delay may have been due in part to the difficulty in securing the data in regard to his life, but more probably it may be accounted for by the fact that "to the hero worshipper, the Secretary of the Continental Congress" did "not prove a very inspiring subject." Be that as it may, his biographer points out that his secretaryship was only a portion of his services to his country and his fellow-man: "A finished scholar, he brought judgment into public life; an ardent patriot, he labored incessantly to strengthen the sentiment for independence in Pennsylvania; a skillful organizer, he aided powerfully to hold together the discordant factions of the Continental Congress; in the retirement of private life, he made a valuable contribution to Biblical literature."

Thomson's life falls naturally into three periods, his early life, his political career, and the closing period of thirty-five years devoted to literary and scientific pursuits. Of the two hundred pages of this biography about twenty-five are given to the first, and some eighty pages to each of the succeeding periods of his life. The volume is subdivided into

ten chapters, the first two of which treat of Thomson's rather eventful early years, and his career as student, teacher and business man. These are very brief, contain considerable matter which is not germane to the work, and add little to the previous knowledge of this period of his life. The third chapter presents Thomson in his first public mission, reviewing his honorable services rendered in connection with the Indian negotiations in Pennsylvania in 1757-1758. The nature of the contents of the succeeding chapter may be inferred from its title, "Charles Thomson, 'The Sam Adams of Philadelphia.'" While little that is new is brought out, this chapter gives a good succinct account of Thomson's share in the pre-Revolutionary movement.

The interest of the student of American history, as well as that of the general reader, will naturally center in the chapter which relates to Thomson's work as secretary of the Continental Congress; not only because his name is remembered chiefly on account of his patriotic services in connection with this office, but also because any new light which may be thrown on the work of the "Old Congress" will be eagerly welcomed. According to tradition, Thomson, after his retirement from office, collected material for, and prepared a history of, the Continental Congress, but his courage failing him, he destroyed his manuscript as well as nearly all the papers he had collected. This loss is irreparable, for he was better qualified than any of his contemporaries to write such a work. Indeed John Jay wrote to him in 1783, when urging him to prepare such a history, "I consider no person in the world is so perfectly acquainted with the rise, conduct and conclusion of the American Revolution as yourself."

The chapter of his biography, which deals with his secretaryship is, we regret to say, decidedly disappointing. It is distinctly inadequate, only thirty-seven pages out of the two hundred are devoted to the most important and best known years of his life, and more than one-half of this space is given to quotations from Thomson's letters and from secondary works. It seems to us that the author would have been able to present more fully the significance of Thomson's work and influence after a careful study of the manuscript records of the Continental Congress, preserved at Washington. Such a study he does not appear to have made. He has therefore failed to add materially to the contributions of Dr. Friedenwald and other investigators of the archives of this Congress, upon whose work he relies and from whom he freely quotes in regard to Thomson's methods of keeping the records of Congress.

The later chapters of the volume, which deal with Thomson's scientific interests, his literary pursuits, his personal character, his home, family and closing days, appear to us to be much more successfully written than the earlier chapters. His biographer pays especial attention to his contribution to Biblical literature, and with reason, for had Thomson never been connected with the Continental Congress, his name would still have been known to classical and Biblical scholars, owing to his translation of the Bible from the Greek. In 1808, after twenty years'

labor, he "gave to the world the first American translation of the Septuagint into English." Several examples are given from Thomson's translation in parallel columns with the texts of the authorized and revised versions, showing that in some instances he anticipated the rendition of the revised version.

Copious extracts from the published letters and writings of Thomson, as well as from a few letters not hitherto published, add to the value of the work. We are inclined to think, however, that the author has indulged in an excessive use of quotations from secondary works. A general bibliography, as well as a special one of Thomson's manuscripts and published works, is appended. The volume presents a neat appearance, and is illustrated with a portrait of Thomson and a view of his residence.

It must be owned that the author essayed a difficult task in preparing a life of Thomson, and, while we cannot regard the volume as making any important contribution to the record of his political career, it presents in readable and convenient form the chief facts of his life, together with numerous extracts from his correspondence and writings, as well as the estimate of scholars upon the various phases of his activities.

HERMAN V. AMES.

Life and Times of William Lowndes of South Carolina. 1782-1822.

By MRS. ST. JULIEN RAVENEL. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Pp. viii, 258.)

A SINGLE golden sentence has kept fragrant the memory of William Lowndes through nearly a century of our history—"The Presidency is not an office to be either solicited or declined"—but it has not availed to keep in memory the facts of his career on which his recognition as a figure worthy of study and preservation must rest. A series of untoward accidents has prevented for nearly three generations the publication of the record of his life, accidents, too, which have resulted in the destruction of the materials for anything but a very meager memorial. His letters and papers, understood to have been very abundant and complete, were intrusted in 1860 to a very competent writer, who duly wrote out a full biography. The death of this gentleman during the war left the manuscript in the hands of a relative of Mr. Lowndes, who also died before he had secured its publication, and with him disappeared, strangely but finally, the entire manuscript biography. Meantime the great fire of 1861 in Charleston had destroyed the whole mass of materials from which this biography had been written. A small collection of private letters and notebooks was all that remained; and now, after nearly forty years of further delay, the reverential and careful hand of a granddaughter has given us the present small volume. We must welcome it as the best and most we are ever to know of a highly interesting character, of one who to his associates and contemporaries in public life seemed truly great and wise, and of one who even in the dimness of the twilight which has so long settled over his memory has still stood as an ideal of noble, unselfish public service. The present biographer has skilfully used her scanty ma-

terials, and her work is marked by a spirit of candor and conscientious care.

William Lowndes, son of Rawlins Lowndes of Revolutionary fame in South Carolina, was born in St. Bartholomew's parish, Colleton, near Charleston, in 1782. At seven years of age he was taken by his mother to London. Here occurred an event which deeply affected all his after-life. Becoming weary while playing a game of ball, he fell asleep outdoors. Rheumatic fever resulted, which he barely survived. As a consequence ill-health followed him through life and ended his days thirty-two years later. Returning to Charleston in 1792, he there received the classical training common in those days, but owing to ill-health he did not go to college. He read law in Charleston, and there in 1802, at the age of twenty, not being admitted to the bar till 1804, he was married to a daughter of General Thomas Pinckney. After some service in the state legislature he took his seat as a member of Congress in 1811. Departing from the Federal family tradition he had become a Republican under Jefferson's administration. At the same time with Lowndes two other remarkable men entered Congress from South Carolina—John C. Calhoun and Langdon Cheves, Calhoun being of the same age with Lowndes. All three held similar political or party views at that time and all promoted zealously the declaration of war with England in 1812. Lowndes's leading interest during the war was the navy, though he gave vigorous support to all the war measures of Madison's administration. He took a leading place, also, in discussions of the United States bank and the tariff. The reports of his speeches are singularly meager, but the testimony to his character and influence and to the impression made by him on all who knew him is abundant. Probably Mr. Clay well expressed it in saying that while it was difficult to say who was greatest, "I think the wisest man I ever knew was William Lowndes." Mr. Lowndes was put before the country for the nomination for President in 1821 by the legislature of South Carolina, and this was the occasion of the sentiment which we have quoted and which has an imperishable beauty. He died and was buried at sea on the passage to England in 1822, when only forty years of age.

To have rescued from further obscurity a character so strong and so refined, and to have given us what memorials have been still spared of so beautiful, and withal pathetic, a career, entitles the author of this volume to the lasting gratitude of all who love high ideals of public life.

D. H. CHAMBERLAIN.

Correspondence of John C. Calhoun. Edited by J. FRANKLIN JAMESON, being the Fourth Annual Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, published in the Report of the Association for 1899. Vol. II. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1900. Pp. 1218.)

This volume can confidently be pronounced the most important contribution of original material on our political history in recent years. It

is a fitting crown to Professor Jameson's efforts in promoting the establishment and successful career of the manuscripts commission and a most substantial proof of the material services rendered to the advancement of the study of history in the United States by the Historical Association by which the expense of supporting the commission has been borne.

By Professor Jameson's unflagging zeal, seconded by the friendly coöperation of the owners of Calhoun papers, some 800 letters from Calhoun were collected, of which something over 500 have been printed. When one is reminded that hardly more than a score of his personal letters were in print before, some idea of the positive increase of our knowledge of his personality will be gained. This autobiographical material is richly supplemented by the publication of nearly 200 hitherto unprinted letters from friends, admirers and political followers. These letters are abundant, beginning with the summer of 1843, and more than half of them relate to the eighteen months from June, 1843, to December, 1845. On the other hand, this class of material is totally lacking for the interesting decade of the thirties. Similarly, Calhoun's own letters are most numerous from 1840 onward. In the earlier period there are considerable gaps, such as from Nov., 1815, to Oct., 1817; from Jan., 1829, to March, 1830; and others of several months. In this period, also, the number of letters at certain political junctures of great interest is small. There is little on the war of 1812 or on the Missouri Compromise; there is one reference to the Holy Alliance, but nothing on Monroe's historic message. No light is thrown on the presidential crisis in 1825, and the gaps in the correspondence in 1832-1833 leave our knowledge of the nullification struggle much as it was before. On the other hand, the Texas question and the political issues consequent upon it and upon the Mexican war receive a flood of light.

It is only with the rise of the Texas question and the increasing divergence of interests and views between the new democracy of the North and the surviving original republicanism of the South that the slavery question looms portentous in Calhoun's mind. Earlier the inequity of protectionism and its baleful political consequences are his main concern.

It will be impossible in the limits of a review to select much from these letters for discussion and therefore I shall limit myself to some general comment and to noting a few items of special information. As revealed by himself, Calhoun stands out preëminently as the conservative. He is not the radical, not the aggressive leader of the slavery interest but the steadfast champion of the republicanism of 1798. The delicate balance of powers and functions established by the Constitution he believed to be America's most valuable contribution to politics, and when time revealed that to the finely adjusted balance between the states and the Federal government there must be added an equally adjusted balance between the sections, Calhoun's life work as a conserver was clear. Only by preserving this last balance could the painfully constructed equipoise of states and central government be maintained or the

wise allotment of powers and functions to the different organs of government be secured from derangement.

If the tariff laws enriched the North at the expense of the South and diminished the profits of agriculture to increase those of manufacturing, the inevitable result would be the more rapid growth of the North and the gain of the Northern element in the House of Representatives, thus upsetting the balance between the sections, and, in Congress, between the House and the Senate.

Fidelity to the Union as originally framed under the Constitution demanded the preservation of its balances without which it could not be maintained. If the North extended westward the South must expand likewise. The annexation of Texas consequently is necessary to the maintenance of the Union. To oppose such restoration of the original equipoise of the sections was in reality to refuse to abide by or to reinstate the original conditions of the Union. Hence the Texas question is a test of Northern fidelity to the constitutional past. If Texas cannot be annexed, the Union is in effect and ought to be in fact dissolved. Similarly, the demand for the Wilmot Proviso or the refusal to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific constitute Northern aggression, for they aim to defeat the restoration of the original balance of the sections. Calhoun could see safety only in *pari passu* growth, and for the more populous section to stand upon its strength and to block the effort to recover the pre-established balance was morally to renounce the fundamental conditions of the Union as originally framed and to force its dissolution. But *pari passu* growth was impossible and the effort to preserve the balance of the sections proved a Sisyphean task.

Turning now from the general to the particular it may be noted that Calhoun in an interview in 1831 (p. 305) declared that his tariff speech in 1816 was "done at the request of Ingham suddenly and without preparation"; that in 1838 (p. 422) he affirmed that nullification had overthrown Clay's American system, in other words, was a success; that in 1840 (p. 468) he declared the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions and Madison's Report to the Virginia Legislature to contain "far deeper and more correct views" of our system of government than the *Federalist*; that in 1842 (p. 528) he prophesied "should conventions to nominate the presidential candidates become the settled practice . . . the necessary consequence will be, that the great central non slave holding states will control the election, to the exclusion of the rest of the Union, and especially the South." This would upset the balance of the government for: "It is, in fact, only when the executive power is under the influence or control of the less populous states and sections, that there is any balance in the system." (p. 539). In 1844 he wrote (p. 616): "I do not know a state or city, which requires to have its politicks elevated to higher standard than Pennsylvania and Philadelphia. In none is the contrast greater between the individual character of its people and that of its government."

The anonymous *Life of Calhoun* published in 1843 by Harper, we

learn, was mainly the work of R. M. T. Hunter (p. 524). The letters of Calhoun's supporters abound in striking comment on current politics and leaders and admirably supplement his own in the presentation of the aims and ideals of which he was the champion.

Professor Jameson has performed his task as editor, as was to be expected, in the spirit of broad historical scholarship and with a fullness of knowledge that make one regret at times the modest parsimony of illustrative or explanatory comment. In only one case was a probable error detected where on p. 599, Calhoun's remark, July 2, 1844: "I see Brownson's *Quarterly* has a short, but very good article on the subject," is annotated by "'The Texas Question,' *Democratic Review*, April 1844, p. 423." The note should have been, I feel sure: "'Brownson's *Quarterly Review*, July, 1844, pp. 402-407.'" Brownson severed his connection with the *Democratic Review* at the time he established his *Quarterly*, January, 1844.

Professor Jameson takes leave of his labors with the remark that "his modest task has been to provide materials with which others may elaborate the fabric of American political history or the biography of Calhoun." A new biography of Calhoun is a great desideratum and one rises from the study of this volume and especially from the editor's introduction with the conviction that Professor Jameson is preëminently the man to write it. He has made the subject his own and he possesses in a high degree the qualities of mind to do justice to all sides and to lift his subject out of the realm of controversy.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

American Diplomatic Questions. By JOHN B. HENDERSON, JR.
(New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901. Pp. 529.)

THIS volume is made up of five separate papers: "The Fur Seals and the Bering Sea Award," "The Interoceanic Canal Problem," "The United States and Samoa," "The Monroe Doctrine," and "The Northeast Coast Fisheries."

The first paper is mainly a résumé of the historical and legal points advanced by the United States and Great Britain before the Paris tribunal of arbitration in 1893. While strongly deploring the conditions that seem to threaten the destruction of the seal herd and condemning the selfish policy of the British Government in this connection, Mr. Henderson concludes that our case was not only without foundation in public law but contrary to principles we had earnestly striven to establish in other connections. He thinks that our contention before the Paris tribunal cannot be regarded otherwise than as an assertion of the doctrine of *mare clausum*.

The second paper deals with "The Interoceanic Canal Problem." After a somewhat detailed history of the various concessions, particularly that of the Maritime Canal Company, the writer proceeds to the discussion of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Mr. Clayton, he thinks, was unduly hurried

into the negotiation of this treaty by the aggressive attitude of England in the Tigre Island incident. It is not so much the objects of the treaty as the failure of Mr. Clayton to accomplish those objects, that Mr. Henderson criticises. On grounds of public policy and expediency he advocates a neutralized canal in the full legal sense of that term and not in the restricted sense given to it by Mr. Blaine. It is interesting to note that Mr. Henderson questions the commercial value of an isthmian canal.

In the paper on "The United States and Samoa" the author draws some very wholesome lessons as to the futility and danger of "entangling alliances." This perplexing question has at length reached a satisfactory solution through the withdrawal of England and the establishment of separate spheres of influence for the United States and Germany. In view of these facts 81 pages appear to be too much space to devote to what may be regarded henceforth as a closed question. As the writer himself says, "In the world's history the story of Samoa can never expect to find a more prominent place than a footnote. In the annals of diplomacy it must figure as a farce."

The fourth paper, on "The Monroe Doctrine," fills 160 pages. This is perhaps the least valuable part of the book, as the facts cited are for the most part well known and the personal opinions of the writer are open to criticism at many points. Mr. Henderson is not an advocate of the Monroe doctrine, which he characterizes in language more rhetorical than discriminating as the *ignis fatuus* of American politics. He seems to deny the power of development or growth in a principle of public policy and judges all appeals to the Monroe doctrine by reference to the original thought and intent of its author. The course pursued by the United States in regard to French intervention in Mexico he regards as in line with President Monroe's declaration but maintains that the action of Mr. Seward was in no way connected with the Monroe doctrine as such, and that the ground of his opposition to Napoleon III. would have been equally strong in the absence of any such specific and permanent embodiment of policy. "In the French invasion of Mexico," he says, "the threatened danger to the United States was so real and apparent that no juggling with magical words was necessary to satisfy the national conscience that interposition was necessary; and it will be noted that in all the official despatches relating to this international episode, no mention whatever is made of the Monroe Doctrine, no statement refers to a 'well established policy,' no precedent is exhibited, and no offerings are made upon the altar of a 'manifest destiny.' " So far as I am aware, Mr. Henderson will not find the Monroe doctrine referred to by name in any official despatch prior to Mr. Olney's Venezuelan letter of July 20, 1895. That Mr. Seward had the Monroe doctrine in mind cannot be doubted, for several of his despatches in this connection, even those from which Mr. Henderson quotes a few pages later, use language almost identical with President Monroe's message.

The fifth and concluding paper deals with "The Northeast Coast Fisheries." Mr. Henderson's views are in no way biased by the attitude

that his own government has assumed with reference to these matters. He points out that our alleged rights of participation in the inshore fisheries of Canada are wholly incompatible with our contentions for exclusive privileges in Bering Sea.

There are a few minor inaccuracies in the volume which may be typographical, but one is surprised to see it stated, on page 312, that the Greek insurrection of 1821 was crushed by the allied powers of Europe, and on page 314 that Canning succeeded Castlereagh as Prime Minister. It is difficult to know just what place to assign this volume in the literature of the subject. For the general reader it is too detailed, from the list of reference books it is debarred by the lack of an index, while the entire absence of footnotes or references of any kind to authorities will render it of little value to the student.

JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ.

Civil History of the Government of the Confederate States with some Personal Reminiscences. By J. L. M. CURRY, LL.D. (Richmond, Virginia: B. F. Johnson Publishing Company. 1901. Pp. 318.)

LIKE Dr. Curry's earlier sketch, called *The Southern States of the American Union considered in their Relation to the Constitution of the United States and to the resulting Union*, this counterpart of it is written in a lucid, candid, and persuasive style. Although the author was an Alabama Representative in Washington for four years before secession, and then divided the next four years between the Confederate Congress and the army, he feels neither bitterness nor personal regret. In most respects this volume is much like a record of a series of monologues by a well-read and thoughtful public man. Scholarly or thorough it does not pretend to be: in reality, it is a popular work in defense of secession, with a description of the excellencies of the Confederate Constitution and an outline of the political history of the Confederacy.

About one-third of the volume, called the "Legal Justification of the South in Secession," is essentially the substance of the familiar Calhoun argument with mollifying variations. Everywhere the question is assumed to have been one of principle and constitutional law; nowhere does it appear that slavery was the cause of the strife or even a chief factor in the problem of getting a new government whose corner-stone should be slavery. On December 10, 1859, Dr. Curry made, in the House of Representatives, perhaps the most careful political speech of his life. In it he contemplated and advocated secession in case either Chase or Seward should be elected the following year, and yet he did not express a single word of complaint on any subject not directly concerned with the Southern interest in slavery. Remove the issue of slavery, and the South would have thought no more about secession than the Northwest did. Why this great difference in attitude then and now, common to perhaps ninety-nine per cent. of the surviving Confederate lead-

ers? They then as confidently believed in the right and the economic necessity of slavery as they did in the institution of marriage. Now there is not an intelligent man among them that does not feel that it was wrong. Therefore, although one grant their claim to a constitutional right to secede, they cannot fully vindicate themselves, even to themselves, without forgetting the chief motive of their action—a determination to protect slavery not only from unconstitutional interference, but to put it out of reach of the assaults of abolitionists and to withdraw from association with a section whose hatred of slavery and slave-holders was sure to undermine and destroy the prestige of Southern politicians. In time it will dawn upon the South that the quality of the purpose of a great political movement is often quite as important as any question of an abstract principle of legality. Suppose we should discover to-morrow that the Pilgrims or the Huguenots were persecuted not because they wished to worship according to their consciences, but to blaspheme according to wanton whims; that the Revolution did not grow out of a tax on tea, but of an attempt of George III., by all legal and some illegal measures, to cause the wealthy colonists to give up the custom of importing and keeping, say, Chinese concubines, what wonderful arguments would soon be evolved by the dogmatists and the theological historians, and how the noble collectors of genealogical scraps would rewrite family “histories”! Dr. Curry produces a good *legal* defense, yet it will not suffice for a justification, which is really what he seeks.

The 172 pages, divided into eight chapters, called the “civil” history of the Confederacy, are a meager but mild and generally pleasing account of many of the leading features of the political history of the four exhausting years of the government’s life. There are, here and there, some really valuable bits of reminiscence and description, but aside from a good chapter on the Confederate Constitution there is little more than the traditional account of men and events. The author rests as implicitly now as forty years ago in the belief that Floyd was a much abused and perfectly upright man, and that the Confederate commissioners to Washington in the spring of 1861 came like angels of mercy but were treated with less honor than prevails among thieves. If Dr. Curry had read either all the records or the statements of reliable historians he would hold very different opinions on these subjects. Likewise, if he had turned to Livermore’s *Numbers and Losses in the Civil War*, he would hardly have ventured to assert (p. 153): “A maximum estimate of the troops in the Confederate army, from beginning to end, would be 700,000.” There were nearly a million. The excellent chapter on the Confederate Constitution is supplemented with an appendix where the Federal and Confederate Constitutions are placed in parallel columns and the important Confederate features are clearly brought out by the use of italics.

The volume has incidental value to the historian. Its mild temper and perfect honesty of purpose, though sometimes misdirected by war-time allusions, ought to make the book attractive to the ordinary reader,

who seeks general information and is not very particular about minor points. Psychologically it has rare importance; it is an almost perfect record of how even the best and most intelligent Confederates came in time, and by unconscious and even amiable self-deception to believe that secession was the necessary result of their sacred reverence for the strict letter of the Constitution.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

The Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy. By JAMES MORTON CALLAHAN, Ph.D. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1901. Pp. 291.)

THE material for writing a history of the diplomatic relations of the Southern Confederacy is quite abundant, but it is scattered through a great variety of publications. Much of it is to be found in the biographies of the public men who conducted the affairs of the inchoate government, in the narratives of naval and financial agents sent abroad by that government, in the published Rebellion archives, in magazine articles, and, lastly, in the unpublished archives of the Confederate State department now in possession of the Federal government.

It has been the task of Professor Callahan to gather into a consecutive narrative, for the first time, this diverse and scattered material and give to the public a sketch of the diplomatic history of the Confederacy. A small book of less than three hundred pages on such a subject must necessarily be only a sketch, as its compass precludes the production of documents or any detailed account of events. The author was well fitted for the task, as he is devoting his life to this class of work, and has already given to the public a number of volumes on kindred topics. The reader will find that the task has been well and impartially done, and that he is furnished with a very interesting account of this most important branch of the Confederacy's efforts and failures.

If the work is examined with the critic's eye there will be found a few, not many, defects. The narrative of events is sometimes repeated in different chapters, and occasionally in almost identical language. This is allowable, in fact proper, in presenting the subject by way of lectures to students at intervals of time, but should have been corrected in book form. There are abundant citations of authorities which are helpful to students and useful to the general reader, but they are not always complete. A citation of "Nicolay and Hay's *Lincoln*," which is given more than once, without designating volume or page, is very inadequate in referring to a work of ten volumes.

Professor Callahan shows that the great object of all Confederate diplomatic effort, and in reality the chief hope of the success of the Confederacy, was to secure European intervention, especially that of Great Britain and France. It was apparent to the thoughtful men of the South that it was an ill-matched contest of arms; that with the overwhelming preponderance of the North in men and material resources the

end was not doubtful, unless one or more of the powerful nations of Europe could be induced to intervene. And there was entertained a confident expectation that such intervention would occur. It is a curious speculation whether secession would ever have been attempted, if men in high places in Europe had not held out hope of governmental action which in the end proved illusory and vain. The narrative of the two missions—first, of Yancey, Rost and Mann and, second, of Mason and Slidell—are full of interest. The exaltation of spirits at the opening of the contest, when Europe seemed convinced that the Union was hopelessly dissevered, and when it was believed the proclamations of neutrality would soon be followed by intervention; the depression that came when it was found that British neutrality was not to be a thin disguise for material aid to the Confederacy, and that Napoleon's ready promises were to have no practical result; the alternate rejoicing and disappointment in London and Paris at Confederate victories and defeats; the duplicity of the French court and the machinations conducted with the British nobility and capitalists—all these furnish the material of a well told story.

One of the most noticeable features of the book is the strong and favorable light in which British neutrality is brought out. Lord John Russell acknowledges his error in allowing the *Alabama* to escape; and, if we except that blunder and his suffering the anterior cruisers to go to sea, it would be difficult to find in the Confederate archives any evidence on the part of the British ministry of partiality for the South. The first commissioners were seen by Russell once only and then in a private way. Mason, who was especially accredited to London, never secured any official standing, and his letters are a constant series of reports of the unfriendliness and alleged incivility of the ministry; and before the war is half over we find Benjamin, Secretary of State, directing him to leave London when his stay was "no longer conducive to the interests nor consistent with the dignity of the Confederacy."

When secession occurred "cotton was king," at least in the eyes of Southern statesmen, and through a "cotton famine" it was believed England would be induced to stop the war. The blockade of the southern ports which brought much embarrassment to Confederate operations was the objective point through which intervention was to be brought about by the diplomatic agents. They felt sure that Great Britain would not tolerate such an interruption of the world's commerce. The narrative under review shows how earnestly they labored to this end and how signally they failed. England was convinced that a people, who within a few months could improvise a navy so numerous and so strong as to blockade effectually twenty-five hundred miles of sea-coast, was a power not lightly to be provoked.

It is curious to note the arguments which were presented to the British ministry and public to influence their action. These appear in the instructions of Secretary Benjamin and in the correspondence and conversations of the diplomatic and other agents of the Confederacy. The effort was constantly made to have it appear that the cause or origin

of the secession movement was commercial, the tariff, the unjust and discriminating taxation ; that the new government was based upon free trade ; and the most liberal promises were held out as to its commercial policy.

The author shows how fallacious were these assertions, that the moving cause of the war was slavery, and that the British public could not be misled by such specious promises. Neither were the Southern commissioners long in discovering what was the moral conviction of the English people. Yancey, who headed the first commission, reported to President Davis "that English feeling was so strong against slavery that the Government would hardly dare to give any help that would tend to perpetuate the institution." And when at last the ruling spirits of the Rebellion awoke to the situation, and Congress and Mr. Davis decided to agree to emancipation, the commissioners were told by their leading British friends "that it was too late to secure recognition by the abolition of slavery."

The book shows us that the diplomatic affairs of the Confederacy were in the hands of able men, and while they completely failed in their great object, it was because of the situation, and not from any want of skill on their part. The narrative also brings out strikingly the effectiveness of the efforts of Seward and Charles Francis Adams. The Confederates were greatly disappointed over the peaceful settlement of the "Trent affair," which turned English public opinion much to the side of the United States. In a spirit of spitefulness, Mason, after several months of irritating experience in London writes Benjamin : "The British Government shuts its eyes to accumulating proof, . . . and relies on the open mendacity of Seward." It was a marked evidence of the influence of the United States among the nations even forty years ago, that a great and heroic people could for four years maintain a widely extended war with armies numbering hundreds of thousands, and disorganize the commerce and industries of the world, and yet fail to secure the recognition of a single government. The story of these events, so attractively and impartially narrated by Professor Callahan, forms one of the most interesting episodes of modern history.

JOHN W. FOSTER.

Currency and Banking in the Province of the Massachusetts-Bay.

By ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS. Part I., Currency ; Part II., Banking. [Publications of the American Economic Association. Third Series, Vol. I., No. 4.] (New York : The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xiv, 473 ; xii, 332.)

HERE is a solid piece of work in a new field well worth tilling. As for its solidity every chapter and page has weight and place in the book. Mr. Davis does indeed intimate that what he has written on the Massachusetts coinage might have been left out, in view of Professor Sumner's articles, which Mr. Davis had not seen. But we do not agree

with the author on that point. This part of his work is as useful as any, and to have omitted it because another writer, however eminent, had already written on the subject, would have been unfortunate. It formed part of Mr. Davis's subject and his book has not lost weight for the chapter. Indeed our feeling all along, in reading the book through, has been that it was almost too solid. Interesting as it is, it is full of hard reading—hard especially in some places for men who do not take to mathematics as economists do. It would have been a help to many, we are sure, had Mr. Davis given us at the end of each of the many long and intricate discussions a short, sharp summary. Mr. Davis himself has now and then felt the difficulty of the lay reader and presented a "summary"; but his summaries are not what we mean, they are not summary enough and not frequent enough. When the book reaches its next edition, we hope that Mr. Davis will, in the way suggested or in some other, help the reader to grip the discussion with him.

In saying in the next place that the work occupies new ground, we do not mean that others have not tilled parts of it, but that the field taken as a whole was a new one. And the author is entitled to the *cum laude* for seeing what was held from the eyes of others and for the wisdom of entering and opening up the land. But there is more to be said than that. Even in regard to subjects which others have considered, there is much for the reader's special profit in what Mr. Davis says. Sometimes the best word by far has been said by him. Nowhere, for instance, is there so full and vivid a portrayal of the dissensions between the governor and council on the one hand or usually so and the house of representatives on the other, as in this book—nowhere except in the original records themselves, which indeed it would be hard to equal. The currency was the rock of offense between the contending sides; and Mr. Davis has put the contest before the reader with great clearness. He has shown us that there is but one thing to admire in the conduct of the house and that is its obstinacy. Those who want to see the working of first causes leading to the Revolution should read these pages.

After what we have said we are hardly called upon to justify our third statement, that the field was worth tilling. Still we should add that the book must be read to enable one fully to realize its value. Any intelligent man who reads it with attention must come away from the reading a better informed man than he was before in regard to a great stage in the colonial history of New England. We should be glad to see a special edition of the work, at least of the part on currency, prepared by suitable emendation, as a text-book for our colleges. If such a thing should be done, a glossary should be added. Such terms as "chancer" and "piece of eight" would need explanation.

Speaking now of Part First, it remains to state the general nature of the contents. The subject "currency" opens with a chapter on the colony bills, and their connection with bills of the province. Then we have the chapter on coinage already mentioned, with explanations of proclamation money and lawful money. Chapters follow showing the cur-

rency troubles, among the most valuable chapters in the book. Here we have excellent accounts of old tenor, middle tenor, and new tenor bills, together with the whole disheartening story of paper issue and depreciation, the vain attempts at remedial legislation, the struggles of Belcher's day, the inflation under Shirley, the connection of the Louisbourg expedition with resumption, the delays and vexations in making payment of the province claim in regard to it, the payment of the claim at last, and then the resumption of specie payments with the silver received. Other chapters follow of interest, among them brief statements of the emission of bills by New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut, with their effect in Massachusetts.

Part Second begins with chapters on what was going on in England in the way of discussions of banking schemes during the greater part of the seventeenth century. Being of a legal turn of mind, we noted with particular interest what the author had to say on the beginnings of promissory notes and their relation to the law. What Mr. Davis says is to the point. The ground, however, of Lord Holt's opposition to these instruments is not stated, and indeed is somewhat obscured by the perfectly true statement that his objection lay to matter of form, since his lordship admitted that the purpose could be accomplished by putting the instrument into the form of a bill of exchange, an instrument already recognized by law. Lord Holt objected because he was unwilling to make it possible to turn money debts so easily into negotiable obligations. He feared for the common law which revolted at the very idea of negotiability; he revered the common law and distrusted Lombard Street. But it should well be noted, at the same time, that it was Lord Holt himself, and not the merchants whom he accused, that was guilty of "opinionativeness"; for the mischief, if mischief it was, had already been done, long before, when foreign bills of exchange were grafted upon the law. Lord Holt was locking the barn after the horse had been stolen.

Chapters on the influence here in America of English discussion and on the various banking schemes in Massachusetts before those of 1740 follow. The Connecticut land bank and the merchant's notes of Boston and New Hampshire, are next disposed of, and then follows a chapter of surpassing interest on the main topic, the land bank and the silver bank of 1740. No more striking chapter in American history touching economics has been written. The rest of the work is matter of detail and need not be specified.

Several useful appendices and a good index conclude each Part of the work. It would have been well to add the precise dates and references for the various issues of bills of credit to the list at the end of Part I. Invaluable cuts in facsimile are scattered freely through the whole work.

MELVILLE MADISON BIGELOW.

The Old New York Frontier: Its Wars with Indians and Tories, its Missionary Schools, Pioneers and Land Titles, 1614-1800. By FRANCIS WHITING HALSEY. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Pp. xiii, 413.)

To students and general readers interested in the local history of New York, Mr. Halsey's *The Old New York Frontier* is a very welcome volume. The author evidently inherited his task, for he tells us that his interest in the events described in the book began while he was preparing to republish the reminiscences of his father, who had settled in Unadilla in 1840. Born and brought up in Unadilla, Mr. Halsey brings to his subject that personal interest and enthusiasm arising from perfect familiarity with the localities whose historic beginnings he has described. The book is essentially a local history and its real contribution to historical knowledge is, of course, along the line of local and not general American history. It is true the author discusses many events of a wider importance; the battle of Oriskany, the Sullivan expedition, the Iroquois, are subjects that appeal to the student of the general history of America and that possess an importance extending far beyond the boundaries of the state of New York. But it is not in the discussion of these more general topics that the real value of the book lies; the chapters that deal with purely local affairs are the most original and valuable. The author takes a keen interest in these local events and discusses them in an entertaining style that is rarely attained by the writer on local history. Mr. Halsey informs us that he has gathered still more material relating to the history of the Susquehanna country and it is to be hoped that he may some day complete the story of the Susquehanna settlements.

The first chapters of the work deal with the Indians that lived in the region of the upper Susquehanna. A large portion of the book is a history of the Susquehanna region during the Revolutionary conflict. The investigations of Mr. Halsey tend to confirm the conclusions of earlier writers that the atrocities of the border conflicts are not to be laid at the door of Joseph Brant, but that the Butlers and the Tories were more cruel and revengeful than the savages themselves. On the whole, the author shows a commendable calmness and impartiality in discussing the border warfare in New York. The concluding chapters of the book present an account of the Susquehanna country from the end of the Revolution to the commencement of the nineteenth century. The desolated Susquehanna settlements were repopled to a large extent by settlers from New England, especially from Connecticut.

A few criticisms may be noted. The title of the book is perhaps somewhat misleading. It is certainly not the entire frontier of New York whose history Mr. Halsey attempts to trace. "The Old New York Frontier" may be an attractive title, but the Susquehanna Frontier would have been a title more accurately describing the contents of the book. The author helps to perpetuate the notion that Hudson was a Dutchman by calling him "Hendrick" (p. 6). He waxes perhaps too enthusiastic

over the Iroquois who he believes gave birth to self-government in America and "effected a union of States." Whether the term "States" may be applied to the tribal system of the New York Indians is at least questionable. While Mr. Halsey has drawn to some extent upon W. W. Campbell and to a greater extent upon W. L. Stone for his facts, he has also added considerable new material. Although not a piece of scientific historical writing in the sense that authorities are carefully indicated in footnotes, it is apparent that the book is the result of painstaking investigation. An excellent bibliography of printed and manuscript material relating to the Susquehanna frontier completes the volume.

C. H. RAMMELKAMP.

A Historical Geography of the British Colonies. By C. P. LUCAS. Vol. V., Canada. Part I. (London and New York: Henry Frowde. 1901. Pp. 370.)

DEAN STANLEY, in the preface of his interesting work, *Sinai and Palestine*, has pointed out the connection between history and geography. He says: (1) An insight into the geographical features of any country may elucidate the general character of a nation to which it has furnished a home. (2) The geographical situation of a country may have influence upon the forms and expressions of its poetry, its philosophy and its worship. (3) The connection between history and geography is seen in the explanation of the events that have occurred in any locality, as, for example, between a battle and a battle-field, a campaign and the seat of war. The method of the historian seeking as a geographer to elucidate history may evidently be followed with much profit. The question arises, does the present work fairly deserve the title of an historical geography? No doubt the first sixty and the last twenty pages of the work—about one-quarter of the whole—do pay some attention to the relation of the topography to the events being described, yet the remainder of the book is very much after the model of our ordinary Canadian histories.

In one respect it falls short of these histories. The history of French Canada is admittedly the most difficult portion of Canadian history to treat, and the most barren of results to the painstaking historian. No work on this period has yet equalled that of Garneau, written in the French language. He succeeded in giving a fair picture of the social and political history of New France. The present work on historical geography has completely ignored these phases of the subject and has paid chief attention to the exploration of the water system of New France, and to the wars of the two rivals in the New World—England and France. So much is the latter feature prominent, that the work might fairly be classed as what the school of Green would call "a drum and trumpet history." But while this is true, yet the work is a very interesting treatment of the history of Canada up to the time of the conquest of 1759.

The writer has a clear and epigrammatic style, much facility of expression, and the happy faculty of illustrating the points of Canadian his-

tory by rapid reference to the history of other lands. His method of laying hold of some remote allusion to the point under discussion from works of biography or general literature is very effective. Chapter VII., "Louisbourg," and Chapter IX., "The Conquest of Canada," are the best as to treatment in the book, and the author has evidently undertaken them *con amore*. The exploratory part, which is largely a condensation of Parkman, does not seem very well done, while the closing chapter of general summary is labored—not spontaneous—and is the least interesting part of the work.

A few small inaccuracies occur in the book. There seems no reason for using the antiquated form *habitans* instead of *habitants*. Though the name "Griffin" is given to La Salle's unfortunate vessel in school histories, yet the form "Griffon," the original name, would be better for this work. Most Canadian historians have preferred the form "D'Aulnay" to "D'Aunay" for the powerful enemy of the La Tours of St. John. Duluth, the great leader of early *voyageurs*, should hardly be called a *coursier de bois*. The distinction in the use of "Hudson" for the bay and "Hudson's" for the company is not usually followed by our author as it ought to be.

While we should have been better satisfied if in the volume before us there had been a fuller treatment of the great work done by Laval in the higher sphere, and by Talon, the intendant, on the material side of life in New France, and would have thought it necessary to describe somewhat fully the restrictions on trade, the gross corruption in all departments of the public service, and especially the apathy produced among the French Canadians by the career of the scoundrel Bigot, as causes of the fall of New France, yet we appreciate highly the book looked at from the author's point of view, and are delighted to see the appearance of the series treating the history of the colonies of the British Empire in so pleasing a manner.

GEORGE BRUCE.

The Early Trading Companies of New France: a Contribution to the History of Commerce and Discovery in North America. By H. B. BIGGAR, B.A., B.Litt. (Oxon.). (Toronto: University of Toronto Library. 1901. Pp. xii, 308.)

IN the settlement and exploitation of New France, the ambitious court at Versailles was chiefly impelled by greed of dominion—the thing which to-day we call imperialism. French courtiers and military men were possessed by a passion for high adventure, and eagerly sought this new field of endeavor; merchants and ship-masters, particularly in the northern ports, yearned for the loaves and fishes of the fur trade; ecclesiastics, then conducting splendid missionary enterprises in South America and Asia, had a chivalrous desire to Christianize the wild men of North America. The history of New France has therefore to be approached from several points of view: that of the political agent, of the

professional explorer, of the missionary and of the commercial exploiter. Not least of these is the last named, for never was a colonial enterprise more completely dominated by the fur trade. While most other elements in the dramatic story of New France have been quite fully treated by monographists, or have been elucidated by masses of documentary material—such as Champlain's *Voyages*, the writings of the Jesuits, the journals and memoirs of Lescarbot, Hennepin, Perrot, Radisson, Le Clercq and Charlevoix and the collections of Margry—it has remained for Mr. Biggar to give us the first detailed account of the great trading companies which for a half century controlled its fortunes.

Enormous profits were early reaped from the fur trade of the St. Lawrence region. Fishermen resorting to the Banks, to Newfoundland and to the lower reaches of the river, first bartered with the natives. John Cabot's ship (1497) conveyed small stocks of goods from "divers marchants of London," and in his little fleet were "three or foure small ships fraught with sleight and grosse marchandizes, as course cloth, Caps, laces, points and other trifles." The records of the sixteenth century abound in references to a far-reaching commerce by fishermen and small adventurers.

In 1588, two nephews of Cartier were granted a monopoly of the trade, in consideration of money due their uncle; but opposition from the Brittany merchants was so persistent that after a few months the right was annulled by the court. A monopoly was, however, granted to Chauvin in 1600, but it was withdrawn at the end of three years. De Monts, the founder of Ste. Croix and Port Royal, held a monopoly from 1604-1608. Freedom of trade followed, from 1609-1613. Champlain's Company of Associates, comprised of Rouen and St. Malo merchants, held New France in their grasp from 1614-1620. A company organized by the De Caens, for a time were rivals with the Associates, but in 1622 they united fortunes, the joint monopoly continuing until 1627, when it was succeeded by the Company of New France, or "Hundred Associates," personally controlled and managed by Richelieu. The operations of the company were suspended during the English occupation of Canada (1629-1632), but their place was taken by the Scottish and English Company, who made great gains, although much beset by small rivals who chafed under the exclusive privileges of the great. When Canada was ceded back to France, the Hundred Associates resumed their control of the political and commercial affairs of the colony. The charter of the company obliged them to settle 4,000 colonists in New France before 1643; to lodge and support them for three years; and then to give them cleared lands for their maintenance. The vast expense attending this undertaking was beyond the ability of the Associates; therefore, in 1645, they transferred to the inhabitants of Quebec their monopoly of the fur trade, with their debts and other obligations—retaining, however, their extensive seigniorial rights. Finally (Feb. 24, 1663), the Hundred Associates abandoned their charter, and New France became the property of the Crown.

Mr. Biggar's account, being confined to "the early trading companies," ceases with the resumption of operations by the Company of New France in the summer of 1633. He has given us a comprehensive résumé of the commercial history of the province up to that point, with every indication of earnest study of original authorities, tempered by judicious discrimination. Foot-notes, chiefly of citation, abound; and of the 296 pages of text, 126 are devoted to a detailed recitation and helpful discussion of the principal sources for the study of New France. An excellent working index is another acceptable feature of this admirable monograph.

R. G. THWAITES.

China and the Allies. By A. HENRY SAVAGE LANDOR. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1901. Two Vols., pp. xxv, 382; xxv, 446.)

THE object of this work is to furnish a brief account of the organization of the Boxers and a detailed history of the military operations which ended in the capture of Peking and the deliverance of the foreigners and Chinese Christians shut up in the legations in the summer of 1900. The author appears to have been present at the capture of Tientsin and on the successful march of the allied troops to Peking. He gives a diary of the events occurring during the siege of the legations. He compiled it from the statements of persons who were shut up in the city. But he has furnished us the most minute and complete account of what befell them that we have seen. Much interest is added to his narrative by excellent maps of the country traversed and of the battle-fields, and by numerous pictures of buildings and scenes. Many of these are reproductions of photographs taken by the author, sometimes while under fire.

Of especial value to one who wishes to study the history of these hostilities are the edicts of the Emperor and proclamations issued by the Boxers and by Chinese commanders. These reveal very plainly the means taken by the Boxers to incite hatred of the foreigners and also the sympathy of many of the high officials with the Boxers, even when they were pretending to foreigners that they were endeavoring to suppress them. A number of these papers are, it is believed, for the first time spread before English-speaking readers, and throw great light on the motives, temper and purposes of Chinese leaders. Very significant are copies of papers found in the office of the viceroy at Tientsin, whose conduct the British consul, deceived, had been reporting to his government as "very correct." These papers show that he had been paying rewards for the heads of foreigners and pensioning the families of Boxers, while persuading the foreign consuls that he was busy in endeavoring to put down the Boxers.

It is well-known that secret societies have long been numerous in China. They have had various objects, political, economic, social, religious. Mr. Landor traces the Boxer society back as far as 1747, when it was active in causing the expulsion of the Jesuits, and identifies it with a

secret society, which the government endeavored to suppress in 1809. The members have always been opposed to foreigners. Mr. Landor says, and truly we believe, that in their recent uprising they had in mind not exclusively attacks on missionaries and native converts to Christianity, but also attacks on all "foreign devils." The reform movement of 1898 at the court, the seizure of territory by foreign nations, the failure of crops in the northern provinces, the threats by Europe of dividing the empire, all conspired to intensify the hatred of foreigners. At first, railway engineers and consular officers were slain as ruthlessly as missionaries. In the end, the missionaries who were killed were more numerous than other victims, because they were scattered through the interior of the country whence escape was impossible. The author involves the Buddhist priests heavily in the blame for the attacks on foreigners. One cannot but question whether his sufferings at the hands of the Buddhist Lamas in Tibet have not led him to judge too harshly of the priests in China proper. Apparently the sight of one (Vol. II., p. 248) fills him with such rage that he cannot resist the temptation to seize him by the neck and throw him out of doors.

He criticises severely, but not unjustly, most of the foreign ministers at Peking for being so reluctant to believe the warnings, given them at an early date by the missionaries, of the impending danger. He has many unfavorable comments on the British minister, Sir Claude MacDonald.

His careful narrative of the siege of the legations, arranged as a diary, is so minute and vivid, that one can hardly persuade himself that the author was not present. The great event will probably never be paralleled. The fortitude, bravery, and patience of the women as well as of the men will always make the siege one of the most memorable on record. The narrative of the siege of the French cathedral is one of the most thrilling chapters in the history of sieges, and is well told, mainly in the words of Bishop Favier, who was in the cathedral enclosure from the beginning to the end.

The characterization of the soldiers of the different nations furnishes some of the most interesting chapters. His commendations of the Americans are hearty, though he criticises the American commander for not studying enough the comfort of his men, especially in the choice of grounds for camping. Like all observers, he indulges in high praise of the Japanese for excellence of organization and bravery in action. His description of the Chinese regiment, which the British brought up from Wei-Hai-Wei shows that General Gordon was right in saying that with proper training and under good leadership the Chinese make excellent soldiers.

These volumes are so bulky and the interest in the long narrative is so well sustained that the author might well have omitted about a hundred pages of matter not immediately connected with his story. Several chapters are devoted to a journey which he made to a Trappist monastery in 1891, and several others to a sketch of the conquest of China by the Manchus and to a brief history of the Emperors for the last two cen-

turies and a half. Interesting in themselves these chapters treat of subjects remote from the main theme, and unduly swell volumes already quite large enough. The publishers have spared no pains to present the work in an attractive form.

JAMES B. ANGELL.

La Methode Historique appliquée aux Sciences Sociales. Par Ch. Seignobos, Maître de Conférences à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris. (Paris, Alcan, 1901, pp. ii, 322.) This little book, the outgrowth of a course of lectures given at the Collège Libre des Sciences Sociales at Paris, falls into two parts of about equal length. The first is a general account of the processes of historical criticism and historical synthesis, and thus covers much the same ground as the *Introduction aux Études Historiques* of Langlois and Seignobos. The presentation is, however, simpler and clearer than in the *Introduction*; the doctrine is more carefully worked out at some points, as in the distinction between legal and historical evidence and between the methods of the natural and those of the social sciences. The illustrations, too, are chosen mainly from the fields of the economist and the statistician, and much that would interest primarily the historian is omitted. The second part deals with the application of historical method to *histoire sociale*, by which the author means the history of economic and demographic facts and theories. To M. Seignobos history is not a science; there is no body of facts which are by their nature historical; things become historical only by virtue of being indirectly, or historically, known. History is only a method, but it is a method which is absolutely fundamental for the social sciences, since by far the greater portion of their materials, even when contemporary, comes to the investigator indirectly, as the result of others' observation, and since the phenomena of the present cannot be understood without taking account of their evolution from the past. The difficulties of method and subject-matter which have retarded the development of economic history till it lags behind all other branches of history, are examined in a series of chapters which consider at some length the nature of the subject and its relations to other fields of historical study. The author distinctly rejects the so-called materialistic conception of history. The economic facts are not fundamental; the form of production does not determine political organization or intellectual and social life, but is rather determined by them. "Economic history can be understood only by the study of the other branches of history; it is only a fragment of the general history of humanity." The second part of the book is addressed more directly to students of social science than to historians, but the subjects treated are closely related to the general field of history, and the discussion is so fresh and original and contains at the same time so many sound observations that it deserves to be widely read. The volume should certainly be translated into English.

C. H. H.

The Handy Dictionary of Biography. By Charles Morris. (Philadelphia, Henry T. Coates and Co., 1901, pp. 607.) The writer of this volume is probably right in saying that a short biographical dictionary is likely to prove useful where a comprehensive series of bulky volumes cannot be used or is not attainable. And in all probability a book containing information about persons who are still living, and who have won recognition in our own day, has its interest and its value for the reader and the student. But to prepare such a work is a difficult and serious task; the selection of names that are properly included, and above all the omission of those that cannot be given space, call for judgment, discrimination and wide knowledge, while scrupulous accuracy—always to be desired—seems especially necessary, when only the most essential facts can be given. So onerous is the burden of preparing such a work that one hesitates to criticise with severity. Neither absolute freedom from error nor perfect discretion in choice of subject can be demanded. We can justly challenge, however, the wisdom of omitting such names as George Rogers Clark, Peter Cooper, John Winthrop and Adoniram Judson, when space is found for scores of others who by no criterion can be judged so worthy of treatment. If William Penn merits a page and a half, a few lines, it would seem, could be given Frontenac, or Charles or Thomas Pinckney. Great as was the influence of Thomas Paine on the American Revolution it seems scarcely right that he should have ten times the space of Richardson or Sterne. Mendelssohn and Bach together are allotted less than one-fifth the space occupied by Wagner. It does not seem hypercritical to object to assigning as much space to Quay as to Aristides, and the same consideration to Tweed and to Themistocles. Cleon's name has been omitted altogether. Surely Vercingetorix is no more important for modern readers than Vergennes who is not mentioned at all.

To speak definitely concerning the accuracy of the volume is impossible. On the whole it seems fairly accurate; but there are a number of somewhat serious errors suggesting that diligent search would detect more. To say the least the treatment of the Cabots does not tally with the results of latest research. The writer may not know that the orthodox Puritanism of Miles Standish is in doubt. The narratives of the lives of Clay and Jackson need thorough and radical revision. Cass did not move with Hull into Canada in 1817. Calhoun did not graduate from Yale in 1802, nor retire from the Senate in 1833 to be appointed "the next year" Secretary of State under Tyler; to say that he signed the treaty for the annexation of Texas, while literally true, is very misleading. Monroe was sent to France in 1803 not in 1802. The names McClellan, McMaster, McPherson and others are not correctly spelled.

My Autobiography, A Fragment. By Professor F. Max Müller, K.M. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, pp. x, 318). Max Müller is always entertaining. When one is not laughing at his vanity one can find a rich store of quaint stories in what he writes. *Auld Lang Syne*

gave a taste of the author's amusing garrulity, and this book is a continuation of *Auld Lang Syne*, for the fact that it is an autobiography is unimportant. *My Autobiography* retails a quantity of anecdotes and when the author is not meditating on his own greatness, he is just as interesting telling bits of Oxford gossip. Valuable is the picture of Oxford as it was, or is, for the author seems to be uncertain whether any change has taken place. But if it has not changed, one wonders why it is called a university. According to Müller's statements, not even the classics were understood, and the boys (one can scarcely call them men) came up unable to read at sight a line of Latin or Greek. The professors' lectures were never attended, because the boys were interested only in the tutors who crammed them for the examinations which they themselves subsequently held. This chapter on Oxford life reads like a malignant caricature, but it must be true. Another on German university life sixty years ago, though not offering anything particularly new, yet gives a vivid sketch of past conditions. The rest of the volume is what might have been expected from the author, personal reminiscences, which here and there cast a fresh light on some of his contemporaries. The whole is marred, however, by the marvellous conceit of the author and by his unpleasant attitude toward the "bishops, archbishops, judges, ministers, and all the rest" who condescended to be friends with him. He naturally "at first felt awkward" in the presence of an archbishop who "had an income of ten thousand pounds a year," but it is pleasant to learn that he "never made the archbishop blush for him." As a whole the book gives rather a pitiable exhibition of a great scholar's decadence, but as chit-chat it is readable and the two chapters already mentioned have some historical interest.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

A Short History of the Greeks, from the Earliest Times to B. C. 146. By Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. [The Cambridge Series for Schools and Training Colleges.] (Cambridge University Press, 1901, pp. xxiv, 388.) The author is already well and favorably known by his translation of Polybius, and the manual of Greek history which he now adds to the large number already existing is distinguished from the others by the space and dignity and interest which he gives to that period of Greek history which lies between the meteoric career of Alexander and the absorption of Greece into the Roman empire. Here, of course, Polybius is our main source. Perhaps, under the circumstances, the proportion (74 to 299 pages) of the work allotted to this period might have been even larger, without lessening the usefulness of the whole. The story of Greece from the Persian wars to the death of Alexander has been told so often and so thoroughly that the interest of both teachers and pupils is apt to be deflected from the really more important periods of juncture between Oriental and Greek history, and between Greek and Roman history.

Another excellence of this new manual is its successful illustration of

"the political life and intellectual activities of the Greeks wherever they lived, not only in Greece proper, but in the larger Greece of Italy, Sicily, and Asia." "This has been the tendency in all the better manuals of Greek history since the great work of Holm, notably in those of Bury and Botsford. On the whole, the author has successfully resisted the temptation which besets all who would tell the story of the Hellenes, and has not given Athens an undue share, nor allowed the Peloponnesian war to subtend as large an angle of his mental vision as it did for Thucydides its historian.

Over-conservatism, even in a school manual, is shown in many places. The Pelasgians, since Professor Ridgeway's epoch-making article in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for 1896, are entitled to more notice than they get in the passage dealing with the earliest inhabitants of Greece. The Homeric question is treated in an antiquated manner. The "affair of Cylon" is still put after the legislation of Draco, in spite of Aristotle, Busolt, and J. H. Wright. Themistocles is made one of the generals at Marathon, for which there is not a particle of good evidence. In general, the Herodotean adoption of current Athenian sentiment about the time of the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war is not sufficiently discounted or corrected. In a word, the nicer details of such a manual are carelessly and perhaps hurriedly done. The plan and perspective and scope of the book are the features which will commend it; they give it, perhaps, a reason of being.

BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

Demosthenes on the Crown, with critical and explanatory Notes, an Historical Sketch and Essays. By William Watson Goodwin. (Cambridge, University Press, 1901, pp. ix, 355.) The list of really noteworthy editions of Greek authors by American scholars is not a long one, and it is a pleasure to say that Professor Goodwin has added to it in a manner worthy of his high reputation. Many of those who have been familiar with his lucid and scholarly exposition of the legal and public antiquities of Athens have long wished that he would edit some of the masterpieces of Greek oratory, and it is to be hoped that this edition of the Oration on the Crown may be followed by others. This is not the place for a detailed consideration of the text and notes, but it may in general be said that in this part of his work Professor Goodwin shows the sanity of judgment and the power of simple and clear statement which is so characteristic of all his work. As a single instance of such judgment one may note the omission of *δεῖ* after *ἀγαπητάτα* in § 13. Surely this has been long enough retained in our current texts. To readers of this REVIEW the feature of the book which has perhaps an especial interest is the excellent historical sketch from the accession of Philip of Macedon to the battle of Chaeronea. The complicated series of events without an understanding of which it is impossible to follow the oration intelligently is here placed before the reader in a manner that is at once clear and concise. Professor Goodwin has small sympathy with

the view which would make the policy of Demosthenes an unwise one, a mere foolish, even though high-minded, struggle against the inevitable supremacy of Macedon. He believes that Demosthenes as a true patriot could only defend to the death the great traditions of Athenian liberty.

The historical sketch is followed by short essays on various topics suggested in the oration. Of these the most generally interesting is probably that on the γραφή παρανόμων, the legal process involved in the oration, and the analogy between this form of procedure and the method by which certain courts in this country may pronounce upon the constitutionality of legislative acts is clearly brought out. In essay VI., and in connection with § 129 of the oration, Professor Goodwin suggests as probable the identification of the statue at Athens, representing a Scythian bowman (Kabbadias, Catalogue No. 823) with the figure on the stele described by Lucian (*Scyth.* 2). It may, however, be noted that this statue is one of two (see Catalogue No. 824) which were originally used as architectural members on either side of a tomb, the two figures showing a left and right correspondence with one another. Lucian says of the Scythian's figure ἐπὶ τῇ στήλῃ ἐξεκτόλυπτο, an expression which it seems difficult to think was used of the statue in question. The volume ends with a short description of the manuscripts of the Oration on the Crown and with a brief discussion of stichometry as it appears in the manuscripts of Demosthenes.

J. R. WHEELER.

The sixth *Abtheilung* of Volume VIII. of Dahn's *Koenige der Germanen* (Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, pp. vi, 374) deals with subjects of more general interest than some of the earlier parts—the general character of the Carolingian state and royal power, the imperial office and power and the theocratic ideas of the time as affecting empire and papacy. Dahn's views concerning the revival of the title Emperor of Rome in 800 are well known and have been very generally accepted. The idea of such a revival he considers an outgrowth of the theocratic and Romanizing tendencies of Charles's literary friends of which the chief representative was Alcuin and from this source it passed to Charles. At Paderborn in 799 the Pope became convinced that the revival was inevitable and, though his interests were opposed to the plan, he resolved to forestall the action of the court in order to gain as much as possible from what he could not prevent and to make the title seem his gift. The section devoted to the theocratic ideas of the times and their consequences, though comparatively brief, is full of interesting suggestions, as is also the section on the survivals of popular freedom in the Carolingian state. *Abtheilung* VI. completes the eighth volume and the institutional history of the Franks, and Dahn is to be congratulated on finishing another stadium of his long work begun more than forty years ago.

The old Gesellschaft für nützliche Forschungen at Trier (Trèves) has just celebrated its hundredth birthday by putting forth an exceedingly interesting work. It is a reproduction of the Psalter of Archbishop Eg-

bert, better known as the *Codex Gertrudianus in Cividale*. The beauty of this unique manuscript has long been known to specialists; but its strange and romantic history is now first revealed, and throws a new and somewhat startling light both on the ecclesiastical relations of West and East and on the development of medieval art. Egbert of Trier (977-993) was one of the most eminent patrons of the budding art of his time; and it was, as now appears, the monks of the old Swabian Abbey of Reichenau, the earliest center of German pictorial art under the Saxon Emperors, who prepared for the prelate this masterpiece, thus paving the way, by the emulation it kindled in its new home, to the rise of that West-German school, at Trier and at Echternach, of whose bloom in these days of the Ottos so many evidences have of late been coming to light. Straying then far eastward by channels still only conjectural, the book next appears in Russian keeping; and the pictures and prayers added to it by Slavic craftsmen give vividness to an almost forgotten scheme of Pope Gregory VII. for winning to Latin obedience the House of Kiev and its realm. Dark again and devious is the volume's route from the Russian Grand-Princess Gertrude to the saintly hands of Elizabeth of Thuringia, its next demonstrable possessor. But one journey remained; and how by gift it passed from St. Elizabeth to the cathedral church of her uncle Berthold in Cividale, the ancient capital of the Lombard dukes, is told by the manuscript itself. That such a volume, bearing on its pages the stamp of all these vicissitudes, is made accessible to study, though only by photography and in extract, is an event of moment. And the able scholars who have chosen from its portraits, its ornamentation, its text, that best deserving reproduction—Librarian, Dr. Max Keuffer, of Trier, who contributes the introduction, Dr. H. V. Sauerland, the Lotharingian historian, who tells of its story and its liturgical make-up, and Dr. Arthur Haseloff, who deals with its art—have added much to its value by including in their treatment, both in text and illustration, the whole calligraphic activity of the period.

G. L. B.

Francis and Dominic and the Mendicant Orders. By John Herkless, D.D. [The World's Epoch-Makers.] (New York, Scribner, 1901, pp. 237.) This is a popular account of the life and work of the two saints, followed by chapters on "Progress of the Orders," "The Mendicants and the Inquisition," "The Mendicants and Scholasticism," and "The Degradation of the Orders." The author writes sympathetically and lovingly of St. Francis, and points out his influence upon the trend of modern thought. The book as a whole, however, is lacking in interest and is written without sufficient care. We fear that at times the average reader may receive an entirely false impression, due to the carelessness with which the book is written. It is significant too that for the Inquisition the author quotes Llorente and Mosheim, and not Lea and Molinier. The bibliography given at the end is inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Professor Lodge has added in his *The Close of the Middle Ages* (New York, The Macmillan Co., pp. xi, 570), another somewhat dreary sketch of political events to the somewhat juiceless series known as "Periods of European History." He confines himself to the period 1273-1494. His chronicle is but slightly more philosophic than one of the ninth century, and he shows that extraordinary partiality for proper names which one finds in the Catalogue of the Ships or in an Icelandic Saga. To judge from the index Professor Lodge has found occasion to mention within the modest compass of his volume upwards of a thousand proper names. Obviously if the capture of the fortresses of Elna and Girona, "both after an obstinate resistance" by Philip le Hardi and the fact that Giovanni the third son of Sixtus IV.'s brother succeeded Lionardo an older nephew as prefect of Rome and married the daughter of Federigo da Montefeltro—if all events of similar importance must at least be mentioned in a small volume covering over two centuries of European experience no wonder that there is no room to say anything of European progress except in a most perfunctory chapter upon the Renaissance at the end of the volume, entirely uncorrelated with the rest of the book. Those familiar with Professor Lodge's gloomy *Modern Europe* will find that his conceptions of the function of an historian have been in no way modified by the current discussions in Germany and France as to the proper scope of general history nor by the recent contributions to economic history.

J. H. R.

Savonarola. By George McHardy, D.D. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901, pp. vii, 273.) That the life of the great Dominican has proved a source of perennial interest may be largely due to the fact that the motives of his rebellion against Rome have been so variously conceived. As he was originally forced into the group of "Pre-Reformers," much controversy was necessary to extricate him from an association with the great schismatics of the following century. The later literature has mostly concerned itself with his attitude toward Alexander VI. Apart from this consideration, however, in respect to which it is obviously impossible for the partizans of Villari and of Father Lucas ever to meet on a common ground of agreement, the undaunted courage of the man and his ingenuous audacity in seizing the reins of Florentine affairs in the lapse of Medicean rule are sufficient to establish the attractiveness of his personality, even in a period when strong personal attributes were by no means uncommon.

Mr. McHardy has contributed to this body of literature, already so considerable, a sympathetic and entertaining biography of Savonarola. The writer does not undertake to present new views of his subject otherwise than by a careful review of such material as has been already presented. He has read his Villari, his Creighton and his Pastor, courageously made a perusal of "Romola," and dipped into the polemics of Father Lucas, although his acquaintance with the Innsbruck historian

seems to have had little effect beyond a stimulation of the critical impulse.

Mr. McHardy's book departs in no essential particular from the traditional treatment of his subject. He accepts at their face value the hackneyed characterizations of Roman turpitude which have passed current for centuries and are a part of our inheritance from the embittered controversies of the theological period. To speak, for example, of "the tide of pollution that was flowing from the metropolis of Christendom," is to use a formula which possesses no merit but such as may arise from long usage; it is to look upon that great clearing-house of the business of the Christian world with the eyes of a rustic monk, who thought to find the Roman pontiff with the bare feet and the simple garb of an oriental fisherman; or to estimate an advanced type of life with the mental vision of a medieval man, with whom luxury was a synonym for vice. Such careless statements, of which there is no lack in Mr. McHardy's book, are perplexing and discouraging in recent times, when such an abundance of material is at hand to show what were the real shortcomings of the Roman See and that such words as "pollution" are to be used only after the manner of journalistic hyperbole.

In his first chapter, "The Age and the Man," Mr. McHardy has followed the approved method in setting the scenes for his tragedy. His sketch of the Renaissance is a close following of current estimates, a quagmire between two highlands of faith—a not uncommon view of the period, when one accepts as epoch-making the escapades of naughty dukes and princes, and leaves out of account the more permanent and substantial elements of society. But to fall into epigram and to argue that "the decline of faith meant the renewal of despotism, as it always will" is an application of a system of ready reckoning to the solution of historical problems which would simplify wonderfully the historian's task, if it could be relied upon to work in all emergencies.

MERRICK WHITCOMB.

The Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the papers of Mrs. Frankland-Russell-Astley of Chequers Court, Bucks (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1900, pp. xx, 370) shows that this collection is chiefly rich in material on the life and history of the Russell branch of the Cromwell family. In addition, however, it contains some rather valuable bits of information on the public affairs of the period which it covers. Mrs. S. C. Lomas, the author of the report, also furnishes the introduction, in which the contents of the documents calendared are adequately described and their respective importance justly estimated. They are grouped for description under three heads. The first group consists of the Russell and Frankland correspondence pertaining, for the most part, to the years 1657-1697: it is chiefly of a private, family nature, with Frances Cromwell, daughter of the Protector, as the central figure of interest, although there are, in the correspondence of Sir William Frankland, several interesting notices of the Yorkshire elections of

his time. The Cutts and Revett papers, 1687-1708, which comprise the second part of the collection, furnish some details on the early movements of Marlborough in the war of the Spanish Succession. Unfortunately, however, there is nothing on the campaign of 1704. The third and last series is made up almost exclusively of letters from Lieutenant Colonel Charles Russell, who served on the continent as an officer in the Coldstream Guards during a greater part of the war of the Austrian Succession. His pictures of the daily routine life of the army are graphic and detailed, and, allowing for the fact that he is apt "to show the bright side of the shield" too much, yield new and valuable information on this subject. He also makes occasional comments on the conduct, character and policy of those in authority, and the relations between the English and the allies. His references to Colonel Braddock will be interesting to students of the latter's ill-starred American campaign of 1755. Among the documents calendared in the report, which are not included in the above three groups, the most notable is the note-book of John—afterwards Sir John—Croke, M.P., recorder of London, and, in 1601, Speaker of the House of Commons. Particularly full abstracts are given of his speeches to Queen Elizabeth and King James. A very complete index makes the contents of the volume easily accessible to those having occasion to consult it.

ARTHUR L. CROSS.

Dr. Oscar S. Straus has published a second edition of his book, *The Origin of Republican Form of Government in the United States of America* (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901, pp. xli, 151). The first edition of the book appeared in 1885. The interest aroused by its theory of the origin of the American form of government justifies the present corrected and revised edition to which an introductory essay by Émile de Laveleye, written for the French edition, is added. With the exception of this addition and of a more conservative statement in the closing pages of the thesis defended by the author, the present varies little from the original edition. A few errors reappear in the present revision: John Lansing (p. 139) is said to have advocated the adoption of the Federal Constitution in the New York convention, but the speech quoted by Mr. Straus from Elliot's *Debates* is consistent with Lansing's general attitude and stoutly maintains the opposite view; the year 1819 (p. 64) is given as the date of the final separation of Church and State in Connecticut instead of 1818. The author (p. 3) holds to the traditional classification of the forms of colonial government into royal, proprietary and charter which Professor Osgood has shown to be essentially wrong.

Mr. Straus does not claim "that the structural parts of our form of government were derived from what was believed to be the components of the Hebrew Commonwealth, but only that this scriptural model of government . . . had a deep influence upon the founders of our government." Unquestionably the political thinking of the early Puritans was profoundly influenced by the Old Testament, but that the framers of our

present Constitution were similarly influenced is far from being proved by the author and the development during the eighteenth century by all the colonies, Cavalier as well as Puritan, of essentially the same form of government cannot be sufficiently accounted for by Mr. Straus's theory. Nevertheless the book performs a valuable service in emphasizing an important but often neglected factor in the development of American government.

MARSHALL S. BROWN.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens. A Contribution to Modern Constitutional History. By Georg Jellinek. Authorized translation from the German by Max Farrand. (New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1901, pp. 98.) This scholarly essay, whose author is one of the most eminent of modern German constitutional authorities, well illustrates the thesis expressed in its preface; that an adequate comprehension of the ideas contained in the law of the modern state demands a study of progressive institutional history. Professor Jellinek develops in an able and convincing manner the idea that, in the English historical conception of the rights of the individual, these rights "rest simply upon the supremacy of law—they are law, not personal rights." He ascribes to the Puritan settlers of New England the first historical and practical application of the two great political principles; that certain rights are inherent in the individual and are not derived from law and that government is the result of compact. First applied by the Congregationalists in the choice of a form of church government as an inherent right, the former principle was embodied by Roger Williams in the laws of Rhode Island, and the inherent right of soul liberty thus recognized led logically to the claim that in other departments of life man possessed rights not conferred by law or charter. The latter principle was incorporated in an instrument of government for the first time in human history in the Mayflower Compact and in the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut. These two conceptions, the author continues, gradually in the course of political development became generally accepted in the colonies and formed the essential bases of the Revolutionary state constitutions.

Professor Jellinek proves by parallel citations from these constitutions and from the French "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens" that the principles thus historically developed in the American colonies were taken directly by the Constituent Assembly from the bills of rights of Virginia and other American states and were not derived from Rousseau's *Social Contract*. Historical accuracy, a remarkable grasp of the principles of political philosophy and logical and lucid expression unite to make this little book a work of unusual merit. Professor Farrand's translation is exceptionally good.

MARSHALL S. BROWN.

Arnold's Expedition to Quebec. By John Codman. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1901, pp. ix, 340.) This book covers not only Arnold's expedition to Quebec but the military operations that oc-

curred there up to May 6, 1776. It is evidently the work of an intelligent, well-meaning amateur. The sources indicated by Winsor and some other sources have been used—uncritically; but a large amount of important material appears to have been overlooked. It is an error to say that Topham's journal has never been printed. Dearborn's though apparently used is not in the list. It would have been well to mention that the portion of Thompson's journals referring to this time has been lost. Montresor's journal and Goodwin's maps—invaluable to Arnold—are not alluded to. The really difficult questions, such as the genesis of the expedition and the place where the height of land was crossed, are not attacked, or, like the fortifications of Quebec and the assault, are not conclusively treated. No references are given, and theories are often indistinguishable from facts. A few instances will show how accurate the book is. It gives a full-page picture of the great fall of the Chaudière, less than four miles above the Du Loup, to show where Arnold was wrecked (p. 110); but Arnold's journal puts nearly 60 miles between this mishap and the Du Loup. Of Meigs's division on the "Chain of Ponds" we read: "They passed over the first lake two miles to a narrow gut two rods over, [then entered another small pond about a mile over,]—Meigs], then poled up a narrow strait one and a half miles long; then passed over a third lake, etc." (p. 77); but the words that I have added in brackets are demanded by Meigs's journal, by the facts, and by the word "third." The sentence contains several other errors that I lack space to point out. Mr. Codman speaks of Arnold's men as gathering to cross the St. Lawrence in a "cove of the Chaudière under cover of the mill" (p. 143) owned by Caldwell (p. 134), and says the noise they made was drowned by the "thunder" of Chaudière Falls (p. 143); but the seigneurie of Lauzon, which included the mill, was merely *leased* by Caldwell in 1775, the mouth of the Chaudière was three miles southwest of the mill, and the falls are two and a half miles south of the mouth. The picturesque aspects of the expedition are not wholly ignored, but is it not rather strong to represent the soldiers as hacking down "the giants of the forest" with hunting-knives (p. 58)? The political side of the subject is very inadequately treated; for example, Briand, who worked as hard and did almost as much as Carleton for the British cause, is not even mentioned. It seems odd to find our troops frequently called *rebels*. Only one map illustrates the route, and it is both incorrect and hard to read.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

The Civil and Military List of Rhode Island, compiled by Mr. Joseph Jencks Smith, is intended as a complete register of the names of all officers elected by the general assembly from the organization of the legislative government of the colony in 1647 to 1800. Mr. Smith states that the book is the result of a desire to place in some tangible form the names of the early settlers and their successors who were honored by election to civil and military office. Such a compilation the author as-

sumes will be of interest and value to the descendants of those who are mentioned in its pages. This is true, but perhaps the chief value will be found in its serviceableness to investigators and historical writers. To be able to turn in a moment to a complete and separated list of the colony or state officers for a given year is of distinct advantage, for it both lessens the labor of reference and insures greater accuracy.

The history of Rhode Island from 1647, the date of the organization of Providence Plantations, to the beginning of the eighteenth century is peculiarly complex, and its examination is facilitated by a volume like the present which enables one to take in at a glance the scheme of government in its legislative, executive and judicial branches as it evolved and dissolved and then evolved again. From the early part of the eighteenth century to the period of the Revolutionary war the list consists largely of the names of those appointed to office in the militia, a branch of the public service in which Rhode Island was particularly strong. With the opening of the Revolutionary period the delegates to the Continental Congress—Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward—are mentioned, also the committee of public safety, and in June, 1775, the officers of the colony's navy—likewise a branch in which exceptional strength was shown by Rhode Island.

The publishers of the *Civil and Military List* have made an attractive volume. The paper is good and the print is clear and large. The book however is open to one criticism. The index contains only the last names of persons mentioned, and by reason of this a great burden is imposed upon the investigator. If his search is for Major Christopher Smith, he must look through a list of some 234 Smiths in order to make sure that he has not missed a reference. There is a special index to officers in active service during colonial and Revolutionary war periods, and one to independent chartered companies of militia in the order of charters received.

I. B. R.

The Early Records of the Town of Providence, Vol. XVI., printed by the Record Commissioners under the authority of the City Council (pp. 534), contains the contents of "Will Book No. 2," from 1716 to (practically) 1726. The most conspicuous part of the contents consists of the inventories of nearly a hundred estates. These, with the aid of an elaborate index to all the household articles and other bits of property mentioned, give a good picture of the domestic life of a prosperous colonial community. Only fifty-five out of ninety-five of these minutely detailed inventories mention any books. One decedent possessed a hundred, another seventy-eight; but most had only a few. The Bible, Coke upon Littleton, and "a booke Called Dalton" (Dalton's *Justice*) are the only ones specified. The text of the records is not annotated; but there are, beside the index of things, mentioned above, a general index to names and an index to Indian names.

A Landmark History of New York. By Albert Ulmann. (New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1901, pp. viii, 285). This is another attempt to tread in the footsteps of Lossing, while rewriting the history of Manhattan Island. It may be said at once that few important episodes are omitted, and that few inaccuracies have been detected. In pursuance of his plan the author has introduced photographs of tablets and of existing sites, and has furnished reproductions of maps and various data. In treating his subject chronologically he conducts his readers up and down the island, pausing *en route* to examine the particular landmark around which the bit of history revolves. There are necessarily some repetitions in this plan, but it is probably preferable to the opposite way of, for instance, exhausting lower Broadway and then passing up the east side. Thus with his object lessons before him he sketches the colonial, Revolutionary and later history, showing good appreciation of the strategic points, and acquaintance with the results of recent investigations. At the end is an account of the "origin of street names," followed by a useful classified bibliography.

But when this has been said in favor of the work, it cannot counter-balance the fatal handicap of the literary form. This is no other than the ancient and weather-beaten device of postulating three children desirous of local information, whose wants are supplied by a "professor" of encyclopaedic attainments. The unfortunate victims are transported by the elevated to diverse historic sites, halt like Cook's tourists in front of tablets and buildings, and listen—with comments—to the résumés, anecdotes, and philosophy poured forth inexhaustibly by the conductor. In real life this time-worn system would be ineffably wearisome. In a pretended historical work the method is undignified and farcical. Such a treatise is like our elderly acquaintances the Rollo books, without their naïveté. Why this device is adopted by reputable writers for "young readers" or older readers passes comprehension. "Thus ended the battle of Golden Hill, a fight for a principle, in which the first blood in the War of the Revolution was shed. 'Was that before the Boston massacre?' asked George. 'Nearly two months before, and it was a much more important affair.' 'Hurrah for New York!' shouted Tom. The professor smiled at Tom's enthusiasm" (p. 86).

Let us have our history, our travels, our stories "straight," or as straight as may be. Popularizing history is a laudable undertaking, but there is a limit to patience. It was bad enough when a recent novelist embellished his spirited account of the times of Caesar with such foot-notes as: "*Consul*. The consul was one of the two chief magistrates in Rome." Are we to sink to the level where three Vassar girls chaperoned by Rollo's uncle will offer contributions to constitutional history while strolling along Pennsylvania Avenue or Chestnut Street?

EDMUND K. ALDEN.

The fourth volume of the *Public Papers of George Clinton, Governor of New York* (edited by Hugh Hastings, state historian, pp. xl,

874) presents material which covers a period of only nine months, beginning with September, 1778. A detailed estimate of a section of four hundred pages in the volume shows that more than one-third of the papers are neither addressed to Clinton nor written by him, that nearly, if not fully, one-half of the material comprises papers addressed to Clinton by his correspondents, while less than one-fourth of the space is occupied by the writings of Clinton. Moreover, many pages are needlessly filled with material which, although important in its proper place, is irrelevant or cumbersome in this work. The rather large amount of trivial or wholly foreign material which has been printed can be charged only to the absence of any exercise of editorial discretion. The series of volumes is merely a reprinting of certain bound manuscript volumes at Albany, with a blind adherence to the arrangement of the old volumes and with an evidently persistent purpose to reprint everything in them. The editorial policy seems beneficial chiefly to the state printer. The state historian contributes the enlivening head-notes, used also as a table of contents of 29 pages, with reference to which an earlier comment in this Review (Vol. IV., p. 392) on the work of the same historian is still applicable. It is, however, due to him to state that for the volume of 874 pages he has contributed editorial notes aggregating 123 lines, all of which are weighted by the subscription of the editor's official title. The volume is decorated with a cheap print of Clinton's city residence and with seven portraits of Cornwallis and others, included here for no obvious reason. The absence of an index and of other means for making such material thoroughly useful, emphasizes the injudicious manner in which the funds of the state have been used.

A thorough and satisfactory monograph on the subject of *Redemptioners and Indentured Servants in the Colony and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* has been prepared by Karl Frederick Geiser (New Haven, Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, pp. 128). It is published as a supplement to *The Yale Review*. While the author makes no pretense of writing the history of white servitude in the colonies in general, the work is of such a character that it necessarily covers in a systematic way the beginning and many of the developments of the system; it discloses facts and operative causes that must needs be true of other than the Quaker colony. In the chapter entitled "Historical Sketch of Immigration," the writer has brought together many significant facts; some of them have indeed appeared in secondary authorities before, but many of them have not, and gathered together here they tell an interesting tale of the importance of the system and its long duration. The author asserts that redemptioners continued to arrive as late as 1831; he also declares, on what seems to be unimpeachable evidence, that of 5,509 immigrants landing in Philadelphia between August 19th, 1786, and the end of 1804, over 3,600 were redemptioners. The manner and methods of transportation are also well described, the unattractive details reminding one of the horrors of "the middle passage." Perhaps especial attention should be called to the

author's definitions which are somewhat at variance with those usually found. "Generally speaking," he says (p. 6), "the indentured servants were those immigrants who, unable to pay their passage, signed a contract, called an indenture, before embarking, in which they agreed with the master or owner of the vessel transporting them 'to serve him or his assigns' a period of years in return for passage to America . . . The redemptioner, strictly speaking, was an immigrant, but on embarking agreed with the shipping merchant to be transported without an indenture and without payment of passage, and on landing in America to be given a short period of time in which to find relatives or friends to redeem him by paying his passage." If the immigrant failed of securing redemption he could then be sold in payment for his passage. The monograph is a valuable addition to the literature of colonial history, and fortunately, although sense is never sacrificed to rhetoric, it is written in good, forcible, simple English. A good bibliography and appendices containing forms of indenture, etc., add to the usefulness of the book.

The Arrow War with China. By Charles S. Leavenworth, M.A. (London, Sampson Low, Marston and Co., 1901, pp. xiv, 232). Mr. Leavenworth, who is Professor of History in Nanyang College, Shanghai, has done a service to students of Oriental history. He presents a detailed study of an important epoch in the history of diplomatic intercourse between China and the powers of Christendom. Whatever criticisms may be made regarding the author's faults of style, which are by no means few, or regarding his method of presentation, which is at times confusing, the value of the book must be recognized. Beginning with the seizure by the Chinese authorities of the crew of the "British" vessel "Arrow" at Canton in October, 1856, the book deals with the events leading to the drafting of the treaties of Tientsin, the refusal of the Chinese authorities to ratify these treaties in the manner demanded by Great Britain and France, and the failure of the "British" in the attack on the forts at the mouth of the Peiho. It was on this occasion that Commodore Tatnall, U. S. N., made his now famous remark, "blood is thicker than water," and went to the assistance of the British. The story ends with the ratification of the treaties of Tientsin in October, 1860, after the allied forces had fought their way into Peking, rescuing European officials who, though under a flag of truce, had been captured and imprisoned by the Chinese. The facts are given with impartiality and the vital connection of the various phases of the Chinese question is clearly displayed. Mr. Leavenworth's temper is thoroughly sane in regard to the never ending debate between the party advocating aggressive assertion of European claims to the control of China and the party which looks with favor on the efforts of the Chinese to determine their own destinies and, if necessary, in the last analysis to exclude all foreigners from China; he is not a partizan of either side, and apparently believes that the reform party in China may some day accomplish its purpose; at all events, he

denies wisdom to the policy of a general partition of the empire between the foreign powers, even were such a proceeding possible, which it most certainly is not. In the study of the problem of Asia as a contemporary political question so much is to be learned from history that any endeavor to inform the student as to previous conditions is most welcome; many of the events of 1900 might have been foretold from knowledge of those of 1856-1860; and the continuity of the Chinese question must be clearly understood for historical investigation or diplomatic negotiation. These points are enforced by the reading of Mr. Leavenworth's little book. A well selected bibliography and careful citation of all authorities add to its usefulness.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

NOTES AND NEWS

John George Nicolay, joint editor with John Hay of the well-known *Abraham Lincoln, A History* (1886-1890), died on September 26, at Washington, D. C. He was born in Bavaria in 1832, but came to this country when a child and grew up in Illinois, where he became at an early age the editor of a paper. From 1859-1865 he was one of Lincoln's secretaries. He was later consul at Paris and then marshal of the United States Supreme Court. His historical writings include, in addition to the work mentioned above, *The Outbreak of the Rebellion* (1881), and Lincoln's *Complete Works* (1894).

Simon Sterne, a prominent writer on jurisprudence, died at New York, September 22. He was born in Philadelphia, July 25, 1839. He was educated at Heidelberg and the University of Pennsylvania, was editor for a time of the *Commercial Advertiser* and after 1870 practiced law in New York. Among his writings are volumes on *The Constitutional History and Political Development of the United States* and *Representative Government and Personal Representation*, besides a number of contributions to Lalor's *Cyclopaedia of Political Science*.

The leading article in the *Old Northwest Genealogical Quarterly* for October, is an illustrated sketch of the late B. A. Hinsdale by Prof. S. C. Derby.

We are able to announce a proposed biography of Professor Moses Coit Tyler. The work has been undertaken, at the wish of the family, by Professor George L. Burr. It will not be completed, however, for some time; not until the correspondence, journals and other papers, which are all under seal for a period of several years, become accessible.

In a new two-volume work, entitled *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, Mr. James Bryce follows, through treatments of divers topics, the common thread of a comparison between the history and law of Rome and of England (Oxford University Press).

Mr. John Beattie Crozier offered, some five years ago, the first volume of a *History of Intellectual Development on the Lines of Modern Evolution*, carrying the subject to the closing of the Athenian Schools by Justinian. He now presents the third volume of this work, which deals with the nineteenth century, and explains that, owing to weakened eyesight, he was unable to do at this time the minute research necessary for the intervening period. Since the publication of this volume his course has been

[The department of Notes and News is under the general management of Earle W. Dow and Theodore C. Smith.]

somewhat changed. According to his present plan the next installment will deal with the evolution of Rome from the rise of the Republic to the fall of the Empire in the west (Longmans).

Dr. Helmolt's *Weltgeschichte* is to be issued also in English, with the assistance of Mr. James Bryce. The first volume is out; there are to be eight in all (Heinemann).

We noted in the last number that Professor Theodor Lindner, of the University of Halle, had written a little volume of historical philosophy, designed as an introduction to a history of the world since the Germanic invasions. This history proves to be planned on the scale of nine volumes; four for the period down to the middle of the sixteenth century, and five for distinctly modern times. The first volume, already published, pictures the rise of the civilizations of the east and west, which determined the later course of history (Stuttgart and Berlin, Cotta). Two other recent German undertakings in the field of world history may be mentioned here. The *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, begun under Heeren and Ukert and continued under Giesebrecht and under Lamprecht, now forms one part of a larger series, *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte*. The other parts are entitled *Geschichte der aussereuropäischen Staaten*, to include accounts of the United States, Japan, China, and numerous other countries; and *Deutsche Landesgeschichten*, in which four works already out are classified. *Weltgeschichte in Charakterbildern*, the publication of which was begun last October by F. Kirchheim, in Mainz, is to be composed of forty richly illustrated volumes. The titles of some of the numbers already issued give some idea of the plan: *Augustin. Der Untergang der antiken Kultur*; *Cavour. Italien im 19. Jahrhundert*; *Das Deutsche Volk und die Weltwirtschaft*; *König Asoka. Indiens Kultur in der Blütezeit des Buddhismus*.

The last number of the *Historische Zeitschrift* contains two noteworthy articles of general bearing: Otto Hintze, *Staatenbildung und Verfassungsentwicklung. Eine historisch-politische Studie*; Ferdinand Wrede, *Ethnographie und Dialektwissenschaft*.

Professor George L. Burr sends us the following communication: In the October number of the *English Historical Review* the Rev. George Edmundson, already known through his fruitful studies of the fortunes of the Dutch in South America, publishes under the title of "The Dutch in Western Guiana," a very careful paper on the beginnings of Dutch settlement in that region and especially on the worth of the testimony of Major John Scott. Those who have given most study to the question will best recognize the keenness and thoroughness with which he has sifted it, and at least one of those who have been most skeptical as to Scott's trustworthiness, while not convinced that all difficulties have yet been dispelled and while dissenting from more than one minor detail of Mr. Edmundson's argument, is glad to admit his success in reconciling Scott's statements with what is known to us from other sources and in showing those statements to be possible and even probable.

The occupation of Cyprus by England seems to be bearing fruit now in the field of historical study. Mr. G. Hackett offers the first connected story in English of the fortunes of the church of Cyprus: *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, A. D. 45 to A. D. 1878, together with some Account of the Latin and other Churches existing in the Island* (London, Methuen).

The work of scientifically investigating Eastern Asia shows signs of strength and re-enforcement. The École Française de l'Extrême Orient, established in Indo-China some two years ago and modeled after the French schools in Athens, Rome and Cairo, has begun the publication of a quarterly *Bulletin*, and it is reported that both Germany and Russia contemplate the establishment of similar schools in China in the near future.

A series of text-books in history, with the general title of "Essentials in History for High Schools," and prepared under the editorial supervision of Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, is announced by the American Book Company. There are to be four volumes, corresponding to the four divisions recommended by the Committee of Seven. Besides the editor, who writes the volume on American history, the contributors are Dr. Arthur M. Wolfson, of the New York high schools, for ancient history; Professor Samuel B. Harding, of Indiana State University, for the medieval and modern period, and Mr. Albert Perry Walker, of the English high school, Boston, for English history.

Interest in questions of teaching seems to be on the increase in England. In addition to a volume relating to instruction in various lines, we note, among the late issues of the Cambridge University Press, a little book of essays on the teaching of history. Messrs. Maitland, Gwatkin, Poole, Cunningham and Ashley are among the contributors.

At a meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland at Syracuse, November 29 and 30, a call was circulated, signed by a number of instructors in colleges and secondary schools, for a meeting of all interested in history to consider the advisability of forming a permanent association. The meeting accordingly took place in the historical seminary room of Syracuse University, and after discussion it was voted to form an association of history teachers of the Middle States and Maryland. A committee was appointed to form a plan for permanent organization and call the first meeting. It consists of Professor J. H. Robinson, of Columbia, chairman, Professor Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar College, Dr. J. Sachs, of New York, Dr. E. W. Lyttle, of the Regents' Department of New York, Miss E. Brownell, of the Woman's College of Baltimore, and Professor D. C. Munro, of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor E. H. Castle, of the Teachers College, New York, was elected secretary and treasurer. It was proposed to undertake a careful investigation of the amount and kind of preparation furnished to teachers of history by colleges or normal schools, and required of them by school boards, principals and superintendents.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

It is announced that a beginning will be made this year on the publication of the series of *Ancient Records* to be issued under the general editorship of President Harper, of the University of Chicago. This undertaking is divided into three parts: I. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, 6 vols., specially edited by Robert Francis Harper; II. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 5 vols., by James Henry Breasted; III. *Ancient Records of Palestine*, by W. R. Harper.

We note the appearance in Germany of a new periodical of importance, *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, edited by Dr. C. F. Lehmann, of the University of Berlin, and published by Theodor Weicher, Leipzig. It will be concerned with both eastern and western peoples.

The first volume has appeared of a noteworthy work on Greek history, *Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, in which Dr. Julius Kaerst endeavors to treat the subject less from the point of view of a relatively exclusive interest in the golden age of Greek culture than from the more general point of view of the development of a Hellenistic world-state and of a Hellenistic world-culture. The part already published is devoted to *Die Grundlegung des Hellenismus*, and closes with an account of Alexander's world-rule (Leipzig, Teubner).

The *Revue Historique*, beginning with the September-October number, has a series of articles by A. Bauer, giving an account of the publications in Germany and Austria, during 1898 to 1900, that relate to Greek antiquities. They are a continuation of similar accounts, for the period from 1882 to 1898, contributed by Bauer to previous numbers of the same journal.

Les Institutions Juridiques des Romains is the title of a considerable recent work by M. Edouard Cuq, of the law faculty of the University of Paris. It treats the subject from the point of view of relations with social conditions and with the progress of jurisprudence. Also, another member of this faculty, Monsieur P. F. Girard, offers the first part of a book in the same general field, *Histoire de l'Organisation Judiciaire des Romains*.

The studies of the last ten years in the field of Celtic archeology are reviewed by M. Joseph Déchelette in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for August.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Victor Bérard, *L'Étude des Origines Grecques*, concluded (*Revue Historique*, September); E. R. Bevan, *The Deification of Kings in the Greek Cities* (*English Historical Review*, October); V. Ermoni, *Les Phases Successives de l'Erreur Millénaire* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October); C. Carassai, *La Politica Religiosa di Costantino il Grande e la Proprietà della Chiesa* (*Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria*, XXIV. 1-2).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

We are to have, from Mr. A. J. Butler, of Brasenose College, a history of the Arab conquest of Egypt. Though concerned primarily with

the actual invasion by the Arabs, it will deal with the whole of the reign of Heraclius in relation to Egypt, and will cover the period from 610 to about 645.

The *Notices Bibliographiques sur les Archives des Églises et des Monastères de l'Époque Carolingienne* which the late M. Arthur Giry had drawn up for his projected edition of Carolingian charters appear in the 132nd fascicle of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études*. They contain numerous indications in regard to eighty-nine religious establishments that possessed such charters. Only a small number of additions have been made by the editors.

The second volume of the *Dawn of Modern Geography*, by which Mr. C. R. Beazley continues his history of exploration and geographical science through the period from the opening of the tenth to the middle of the thirteenth century, is now for sale (London, Murray).

Under the title *Opusculs de Critique Historique* Messrs. Fischbacher (Paris) purpose to bring out, at irregular intervals, a series of documents which will include, in some cases, pieces hitherto unpublished, in others, pieces that are now very rare or that are accessible only in poor editions. The series opens with the *Regula Antiqua Fratrum et Sororum de Penitentia seu Tertii Ordinis Sancti Francisci*, edited, for the first time, by Paul Sabatier. It is not the original text of 1221 that is here given, but one of a few years later, 1228 to 1230, in which the original is probably very little changed.

In order to facilitate reference to the Podocataro collection of historical and diplomatic documents, which is in the Biblioteca Marciana at Venice, M. Léon G. Péliissier is contributing a summary of its five-volume catalogue to the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, beginning in the October number. The documents in this collection are important for the general history of Europe in the fifteenth century.

A catalogue of the manuscripts of the Royal Library of Belgium has been undertaken by the head of the manuscript department, J. Van den Gheyn, S. J. The first volume bears the sub-title, *Écriture Sainte et Liturgie*. There will be five or six volumes in all.

The useful *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de Belgique* of Professor Pirenne has just appeared in a second edition, enlarged by the addition of five hundred new titles and a number of notes and references (Brussels, Lamertin).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ernst Sackur, *Ein römischer Majestätsprozess und die Kaiserkrönung Karls des Grossen* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVII., 3); Thomas J. Shahan, *Catholicism in the Middle Ages* (*Catholic University Bulletin*, October).

MODERN HISTORY.

Dr. J. Paquier makes an important contribution to Renaissance history by his *L'Humanisme et la Réforme: Jérôme Aléandre (1480-1529)*.

This volume, however, deals with only half the career of the many-sided Aleander (Paris, Leroux).

Mr. G. F. Chance has an article in the *English Historical Review* for October on "England and Sweden in the Time of William III. and Anne." It is intended to be introductory to others which will treat in detail of the relations of George I. with Charles XII.

Studies of the Napoleonic period have had, from the first of last November, the service of a special periodical, the *Revue Napoléonienne*. It appears every two months, under the direction of the Baron Lumbroso, and enrolls as collaborators more than a dozen prominent European scholars. By its plan it will have in each number something in the way of original articles, of unpublished documents, of reproductions of rare pieces and of bibliography. This last division is to include, in addition to the usual matter of its field, reviews of other than recent literature, so as to form in time an orderly general repertory for the use of investigators. Articles in Latin, English, German, French, Italian and Spanish will be accepted (Paris, Picard).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Rosi, *Nuovi Documenti Relativi alla Liberazione dei Principali Prigionieri Turchi Presi a Lepanto* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXIV., 1-2); G. F. Preuss, *Oesterreich, Frankreich und Bayern in der Spanischen Erbfolgefrage, 1685-89* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, IV., 4); Wilhelm Dilthey, *Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert und die geschichtliche Welt* (Deutsche Rundschau, August and September); Raymond Guyot, *La dernière Négociation de Talleyrand. L'Indépendance de la Belgique*, conclusion (Revue d' Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, September).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Messrs. Cassell and Company are bringing out an illustrated and carefully revised edition of *Social England*. There will be about 2,500 pictures and numerous colored plates, reproduced from authentic sources.

The present status of the study of the Gaelic literature of Ireland and the work that remains to be done are defined, at least in general lines, by M. G. Dottin in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for August.

It was inevitable that the recent millennial celebration at Winchester should be the occasion for the appearance of a large amount of literature concerning King Alfred and his times. Among the more general treatments the little book by the late Sir Walter Besant, *Story of King Alfred*, seems to be received with special appreciation.

It is reported that Messrs. Johnson, Crump and Hewes, of the Public Record Office, will bring out this winter, at the Clarendon Press, a new edition of the *Dialogus de Scaccario*.

The forthcoming volume of *Transactions* of the Royal Historical Society contains numerous texts of documents relating to the collection of Peter's Pence in England, drawn from the Vatican archives by Dr. O. Jensen.

The thirteenth volume of the publications of the Selden Society, an edition of *Select Pleas of the Forest*, by G. J. Turner, will be of service in connection with one of the most difficult points in the history of English law. There is a long preface, a glossary, and indexes of subjects, names of persons and names of places.

The first and the final volumes of the series by which it is proposed to make the rest of the Patent Rolls accessible are now out: *Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III., 1216-1225*; and *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward IV., Edward V., Richard III., 1476-1485*. It will be remembered that Sir Thomas Hardy, in 1835, printed in full the Patent Rolls of John's reign, the earliest extant. This course is to be continued for the reign of Henry III.; those after that are to be simply calendared.

Mr. J. E. Morris is the author of a study of the wars of Edward I. against the Welsh, based especially on unpublished documents. It is of considerable importance for the history of military institutions in the thirteenth century (Clarendon Press).

The latest volume in Mr. G. T. Warner's "English History Illustrated from Original Sources" embraces the period between the accession of Edward II. and the deposition of Richard II., 1307 to 1399. It is contributed by Mr. N. L. Fraser.

One of the late numbers in the "Heroes of Nations" is a biography of Owen Glyndwr, by A. G. Bradley. The volume opens with a sketch of Welsh history up to the end of the fourteenth century. Other new issues in this series are: *Edward Plantagenet, the English Justinian*, by Edward Jenks, and *Henry V., the Typical Mediaeval Hero*, by Charles L. Kingsford.

In the Rede Lecture for 1901 Professor Maitland devoted himself to the subject, *English Law and the Renaissance*. The lecture, with some notes, is now issued by the Cambridge University Press.

Among the well-nigh countless works on the Queen of Scots two of the latest offered to the public are of more than usual import. Messrs. Pott have out *Mary Queen of Scots and Who Wrote the Casket Letters*, in which Mr. J. P. Cowan deals at length, to the extent of two volumes, with the life and reign of the Queen from her accession in 1561 until her death. Through the Longmans comes *The Mystery of Mary Stuart*, by Andrew Lang. This latter book is not a formal and full biography; it rather has the special aim of explaining the bearing of the Lennox papers on the problem about Mary.

Mr. Blackburne Daniell continues his labors on the State Papers of the reign of Charles II. His last volume in the Calendar series brings to students of the history of that period a large amount of interesting and illuminating material for the five months from October, 1672, to February, 1673.

In preparing *The Calendar of Treasury Books and Papers, 1739-41, Preserved in the Public Record Office*, Dr. William A. Shaw has not

simply tabulated an interminable mass of formal documents; he has also applied himself to examining and, where possible, elucidating the methods of Treasury finance.

Among the new books of a more or less biographical order at least two, which bear on the history of England in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, should be mentioned here. *Caroline the Illustrious, Queen-Consort of George II., and sometime Queen-Regent, a Study of her Life and Times*, a two-volume work by W. H. Wilkins, comes from the Longmans. Mr. Murray has brought out *The Correspondence of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1826*, edited by Lady Ilchester and her son, Lord Stavordale.

FRANCE.

An *Office d'Informations et d'Études* has recently been established at Paris, in the Department of Public Instruction and under the charge of MM. Charles-Victor Langlois and Victor-Henri Friedel. Its object is three-fold: to answer questions in regard to matters of science or of instruction which may be addressed to it by professors or by heads of administrative service in France or in other countries; to address to heads of service in the departments interested communications and reports upon educational and scientific questions; to maintain constant relations with schools abroad, like those of Dresden, Upsala or the United States, that frequently ask about young persons who may be available in international exchanges of teachers or students.

Vercingetorix forms the central subject of a recent little book by M. Camille Jullian, of the University of Bordeaux. The Gallic leader appears as a patriotic hero, early symbol of feelings of national unity and independence. There are included some reproductions of moneys, maps and plans, and special studies on Alise, Gergovie and Bourges, archaeological tours, as it were, about the battle-fields of Vercingetorix.

A large volume containing documents relating to the States General and the Assemblies of the reign of Philip the Fair, edited by M. Georges Picot, forms an important addition to the *Collection des Documents Inédits*.

M. Eugène Deprez, of the French School at Rome, has begun the publication of the letters of Clement VI., so far as they relate to France. This work forms part of the series of *Lettres des Papes d'Avignon*.

Monsieur E. Glasson, known especially for his extensive work in the history of French law and institutions, has recently treated, in a two-volume work, the political rôle of the Parlement of Paris from the reign of Charles VII. down to the Revolution (Paris, Hachette).

We have received from M. Alfred Cartier a reprint of his article in the *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève* (t. II, livr. 4), on the political ideas of Theodore Beza. He proves that Beza was the author of the treatise, *Du Droit des Magistrats sur leurs Sujets*, and discusses the circumstances in which that treatise was drawn up and the influence of the theses maintained in it.

The memoirs of the Duke of Saint-Simon on the reign of Louis XIV. and the Regency have been rendered into English by Bayle St. John, and are published, with a preface by James Breck Perkins, in four volumes (James Pott and Co.).

Monsieur E. Levasseur has completed the second edition of his *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières et de l'Industrie en France avant 1789*. He has gone over the ground so fully and thoroughly that this new edition is virtually a new work, which will no doubt be the standard general treatise on the subject for a considerable time (Paris, A. Rousseau).

Les Missions Catholiques Françaises au XIX^e Siècle, published under the direction of Father J. B. Piolet, S.J., has entered upon its third volume, which is to deal with missions in China and Japan. The volumes already out relate to the Orient and to Abyssinia, India and Indo-China; three later volumes will treat the subject for Oceanica and Madagascar, Africa and America.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Gaston Paris, *Roncevaux* (*Revue de Paris*, September 15); Louis Halphen, *Les Institutions Judiciaires en France au XI^e Siècle, Région Angevine* (*Revue Historique*, November); Louis Davillé, *Les Relations de Henri IV avec la Lorraine, de 1608 à 1610* (*Revue Historique*, September); A. de Ganniers, *La Dernière Campagne du Maréchal de Rochambeau*, conclusion (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, October).

ITALY.

Three recently published works regarding as many regions of mediaeval Italy are of special interest: Professor Villari's *Two First Centuries of Florentine History*, translated by Linda Villari (London, Unwin); *Early History of Venice*, from the origin to the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, by F. C. Hodgson (London, Allen); and Mr. William Miller's *Mediaeval Rome*, in the "Stories of the Nations."

To the numerous organs established of late years to further studies in religious history is now added the *Rivista Critica e Storica di Studi Religiosi* (Florence, via Ricasoli, 21), issued every two months. It will contain studies, documents, miscellany, bibliography, and a chronicle which will include an indication of relevant matter in periodicals.

A most useful bibliographical aid is being brought out at Milan, a general catalogue of Italian publications in the last half-century: *Catalogo Generale della Libreria Italiana dall' Anno 1847 a tutto il 1899*. It appears by fascicles, one each month; about a dozen of the proposed thirty have appeared so far. Books printed outside of Italy, in the Italian language, are included with those printed in Italy. The compilation of the work is in charge of Professor Attilio Pagliaini, of the University of Genoa; the publication is undertaken by the Associazione Tipografico-Libraria Italiana. Also mention may be made here of a new organ of information concerning current bibliography, a fortnightly review recently founded at Florence by Dr. R. Quintieri, *Rassegna Internazionale della*

Litteratura Contemporanea. This journal, however, seems to have too large a plan to satisfy the demands of a scientific bibliography.

Noteworthy article: F. de Navenne, *Pier Luigi Farnèse* (*Revue Historique*, November).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA-HUNGARY, SWITZERLAND.

The Wedekind prize for German history, amounting to 3,300 marks, is offered for 1901-1906, to the best work in the way of a critical history of Saxon episcopal foundations in the Carolingian period. Manuscripts must be in the hands of the director of the committee, at Göttingen, before August 1, 1905. Also the Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde offers, from the Mevissen fund, a prize of 2,000 marks on each of the following subjects: Organization and work of the Brandenburg administration in Jülich-Cleve from the end of the year 1610 to the treaty of Xanten (1614); The development of medieval towns in the Rhine region to the formation of the *Ratsverfassung* (about 1300), with special reference to political, legal and economic changes in the towns from the tenth century; Conrad of Heresbach and his friends at the Cleve court, with special reference to their influence on the government of the Dukes John and William. Manuscripts on the first and second subjects must be in the hands of Professor Hansen, at Cologne, by January 31, 1904; for the third, by January 31, 1905.

The celebration last summer by the canton of Basel of the four hundredth anniversary of its entrance into the Confederation was the occasion for the appearance of a useful memorial volume, due to the collaboration of several members of the Society of History and Archeology at Basel: *Festschrift zum vierhundertsten Jahrestage des ewigen Bundes zwischen Basel und den Eidgenossen, 13 Juni, 1901*. A similar event at Schaffhausen led also to a memorial publication, a complete history of the canton from the earliest times to the year 1848.

J. Kont, the author of the admirable review of historical studies relating to Hungary that appeared in the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* for last April, contributes to the *Revue Historique* for September-October a short account of a half-dozen of the most important works in the same field that have recently been published in Hungary. In general, they relate to the heroic age of the Magyar people. The six-hundredth anniversary of the extinction of the Arpadian dynasty in 1301 and the millenary fêtes of 1896 seem to have turned Hungarian scholars especially toward that period.

The first volume of the long looked for continuation of Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte* appeared recently. This part of the work, covering the period after 1648, has the separate title, *Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit*.

Those who are interested in the public law and the constitutional history of Switzerland during the last century will find a serviceable volume in the collection of texts, begun by S. Kaiser and, since his

death, finished by Dr. Jean Strickler: *Geschichte und Texte der Bundesverfassungen der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft, von der helvetischen Staatsumwälzung bis zur Gegenwart* (Berne, Wyss).

Dr. Friedrich Meinecke, the director of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, has been appointed ordinary professor of modern history at the University of Strasburg.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ad. Bachmann, *Nochmals die Wahl Maximilians I. zum deutschen König* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, IV. 4); Walter Friedensburg, *Die römische Kurie und die Annahme der preussischen Königswürde durch Kurfürst Friedrich III. von Brandenburg* (1701) (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVII. 3); Richard Fester, *Die Bayreuther Schwester Friedrich's des Grossen* (*Deutsche Rundschau*, October to December); G. von Below, *Aus der Zeit Friedrich Wilhelm's IV. Briefwechsel des Generals Gustav von Below* (*Deutsche Rundschau*, beginning in October).

AMERICA.

An article of great importance to students of American history is "Present Bibliographical Undertakings in the United States," by W. Dawson Johnston of the Library of Congress, in the September number of the *Library Journal*. A list is given of all bibliographies now in process of construction, the greater number of which have a markedly historical character, and many of which promise to be of the utmost value. This list is unfortunately too long to be given here even in abbreviated form but among the larger enterprises several deserve especial notice. Such is the catalogue now in preparation of the library of E. C. Ayer, of Chicago, which will be virtually a complete annotated bibliography of the North American Indians. It is being prepared by the aid of a score of specialists and will contain over sixteen thousand items. Others are bibliographies of United States and state boundaries, in preparation by the New York Public Library; lists of publications of the national political parties, by R. R. Bowker; a bibliography of the Confederate States, by J. M. Callahan; and especially J. N. Larned's annotated bibliography of United States history in preparation by the American Library Association and intended to include over three thousand selected titles. State bibliographies, it appears, are in process of construction or enlargement for Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Maryland, North Carolina, Louisiana and Michigan. In the same issue of the *Library Journal* is a paper by Earl G. Swem entitled "State and Local Bibliography" in which the author shows what has been done in this line, and offers excellent practical suggestions regarding what needs to be done and how the task should be undertaken.

The Library of Congress has issued an admirable *List of Maps of America* with a thorough bibliography of cartography prepared by J. L. Phillips.

Professor Frank H. Hodder has prepared a volume of outline maps, with notes and suggestions for making an historical atlas of the United States

that will illustrate territorial growth and development. It is likely to be of service for school and college classes (Ginn and Co.).

A useful check list of American county and state histories in the New York Public Library, Lenox building, is published in the November number of the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*.

According to the New York *Staats-Zeitung*, two early maps of the well-known cartographer, Martin Waldseemüller, have been discovered in the library of Prince Waldberg-Wolfegg, by Father Joseph Fischer, S.J. One of them, "*Cosmographia Universalis*," apparently dating from 1507, is based according to its title upon the voyages of Americus Vesputius and others and gives the name America to the present South America. The other map, based upon Portuguese explorations and made in 1516, replaces the name America by Brasilia. If this account is correct the earlier map is one whose existence has been both affirmed and doubted and its discovery is a matter of considerable interest to students of early American cartography.

A volume entitled *Two Centuries Growth of American Law, 1701-1901*, is the contribution of the Faculty of the Yale University Law School to the series of Yale bicentenary volumes. It contains, besides an introduction prepared by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, seventeen different articles covering the chief fields of law and tracing the changes and developments that have taken place since the beginning of the eighteenth century.

A book of sources with a somewhat different point of view from A. B. Hart's *History told by Contemporaries* will be *Colonial Prose and Poetry*, containing selections illustrating American culture and ideals, 1608-1770, edited by W. P. Trent and B. W. Wells (T. Y. Crowell and Co.).

The migration of German Jews to America is the subject of an interesting article in number 9 of the publications of the American Jewish Historical Society.

The Pennsylvania Historical Society is having copies made of the papers in the series entitled "*Proprietes*" in the British Public Record Office, which includes correspondence relating to Rhode Island and Connecticut as well as to the colonies generally termed proprietary. The first installment has been received and indicates that the value of this material will be very considerable.

Israel Putnam, Pioneer, Ranger and Major General 1718-1790, by W. F. Livingston, is a new volume in the "*American Men of Energy Series*." It is written largely from hitherto unused sources in the shape of diaries and letters.

Dean Tucker's Pamphlet, "*A Letter from a Merchant in London to his Nephew in North America, 1766*," is reprinted in the October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* together with

Benjamin Franklin's copious marginal notes from Franklin's own copy now in the library of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

Americana Germanica, Vol. IV., no. 1, is devoted to the diary, or "Tagebuch," of Captain Wiederholdt, from October 7, 1776, to Dec. 6, 1780, edited by M. D. Learned and C. Grosse. This is the first complete publication of a "Hessian" diary and is a very interesting and in places amusing contribution to the history of the time. Captain Wiederholdt was long a prisoner in Virginia and Maryland, and his journal contains abundant observations upon the American of 1778, as well as upon the scenery, fauna, and flora from the standpoint of an honest and not ill-natured German.

A recent issue in Small and Maynard's series of Beacon Biographies is *Alexander Hamilton*, by James Schouler. A life of the same statesman is to appear in the Riverside Biographical Series, by C. A. Conant.

Professors A. B. Hart and Edward Channing have issued as *American History Leaflet* No. 32 "Documents relating to Territorial Administration, chiefly from the Original Manuscripts. 1778-1790."

The third number in the series of "State Documents on Federal Relations," edited by Dr. Herman V. Ames and published by the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, is entitled *The Reserved Rights of the States and the Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts*. The fourth number, which will soon appear, is to be entitled *Tariff and Nullification*.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library continues its series of letters of James Monroe in the September and November numbers, publishing five dated in the years 1808-9 and dealing largely with Virginia politics during the period of Monroe's estrangement from Madison.

H. H. Humphreys has published a pamphlet entitled *A Critical Examination (in part) of Pennypacker's Life of General George G. Meade*, the chief purpose of which is to present the services of General A. A. Humphreys, Meade's chief of staff.

Felix Reville Brunot by Charles Lewis Slattery (Longmans, 1901, pp. x, 303), is not without interest and value to the student of American History, inasmuch as it tells the story of a man, who, holding no high official position, was nevertheless engaged constantly in work of philanthropy and public service. As a civilian caring for the sick and disabled soldiers in the Civil war, as president of the first board of Indian Commissioners, and in other capacities he devoted his best energies to helping his fellows. His life's story is well told by a staunch friend and unwavering admirer.

It is announced that President Roosevelt has consented to write a history of the Rough Riders for the roster of the New Mexico volunteers in the Spanish war, which will be published by the authority of the thirty-fourth legislative assembly of New Mexico.

* The first volume in the series of "Pioneer Towns of America" is *The Story of Old Falmouth* by James Otis (New York, Crowell and Co., 1901, pp. 118). The object of the series is to give in short form readable accounts of the founding and growth of the principal cities of the union.

The Documentary History of the State of Maine, Vol. VII., published by the Maine Historical Society (The Thurston Print, Portland) contains the "Farnham Papers, 1603-1688," compiled by Mary Frances Farnham. These comprise all important documents bearing on the legal beginnings of the territory of Maine, both French and English, from Henry IV.'s patent of Acadia to De Monts, to Andros's commission of 1688, and are furnished with bibliography, index and historical introduction. The whole forms an altogether admirable volume, creditable to the compiler, who began it in the seminary of American history at Radcliffe College, and to the society which procured its publication. It offers a model that other state societies would do well to imitate. The society commemorated, at Portland, on October 1st, the millenary anniversary of the death of Alfred the Great by a series of addresses.

Volume XIV., 2nd series, of the Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings* covers reports of meetings from March, 1900, to February, 1901. Among the longer papers are "John Brown and the Destruction of Slavery," by L. W. Spring; "Early Houses near Massachusetts Bay," by J. F. Hunnewell, and "The Limits of Reliable Memory," by Josiah P. Quincy. A number of interesting extracts from the diary of John Marshall, of Braintree, 1688-1711, were communicated by S. A. Green. A still more important collection of unpublished letters by Jefferson, Webster, Kent and Story in the second and third decades of the last century, was presented by C. C. Smith.

The second volume of F. O. Allen's elaborate documentary *History of Enfield, Connecticut*, has appeared, reproducing the treasurer's and selectmen's records of births, marriages and deaths.

C. H. Lincoln begins the new University of Pennsylvania Series in History with a monograph entitled *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, 1760-1776*.

The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography for October, continues its publication of documentary matter in "Papers Relating to the Administration of Governor Nicholson," "Selections from the Campbell Papers," and selections from N. W. Sainsbury's Abstracts from the British Public Record Office, the last under the title "Virginia in 1637." It also continues its valuable list of "Virginia Newspapers in Public Libraries."

Among the fall announcements the most interesting perhaps to students of Virginia colonial history is that of the reprint of the works of Colonel William Byrd, 1674-1744 (Doubleday, Page and Co.), in special typography and with illustrations.

The West Virginia Historical and Antiquarian Society has begun a vigorous campaign in the field of state history by publishing the *West*

Virginia Historical Magazine, which with the October issue completes its first volume. In the four numbers a strong appeal is made for the co-operation of all interested in local history, archaeology, and tradition, and a number of valuable articles are printed covering the entire field of local history from the aboriginal inhabitants to the recent status of the public debt. Among the longer papers are several on "The History and Archaeology of the Great Kanawha Valley," by the editor, J. P. Hale; a discussion, by W. S. Laidley, of the actual birthday of West Virginia, and, in the October number, a full study of the early history of "The West End of West Virginia," also by W. S. Laidley.

The State Historical Society of Missouri has recently secured the valuable collection of F. A. Sampson, of Sedalia, Mo., who for nearly thirty years has been engaged in gathering historical material relating to Missouri chiefly since the Louisiana Purchase. This collection numbering over seven thousand titles is intended by Mr. Sampson to furnish the nucleus for a great historical library and upon the recently organized State Historical Society has fallen the task of continuing to make acquisitions. For this purpose it has issued an elaborate circular describing in detail every variety of historical material desired, embracing not only books, public documents, letters and newspapers, but early pictures, relics of all sorts and Indian remains. Citizens of Missouri are called on to aid in the enterprise.

A supplement to Dr. Brymner's *Report on Canadian Archives* has been published by order of the Dominion Parliament, consisting of a report of Mr. Edward Richard upon the material in the French Ministère des Colonies. It comprises a classification of the series of papers there filed and calendars of the collection Moreau St. Mery, of documents relating to churches, missions and religious orders, and of royal despatches, first to the Compagnie des Indes Orientales and later to the Canadian government.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. E. Sparks, *Formative Incidents in American Diplomacy* (Chautauquan, October-December); W. Wilson, *Colonies and Nation* (Harper's Magazine, October-December); W. A. Dunning, *The Undoing of Reconstruction* (Atlantic Monthly, October); *The Newfoundland Question* (Quarterly Review, July); H. B. Learned, *College Preparatory Work in American History* (Educational Review, November); J. B. Moore, *John Marshall* (Political Science Quarterly, September); T. C. Smith, *Expansion after the War, 1865-1871* (Political Science Quarterly, September); W. L. Cook, *Present Political Tendencies* (Annals of the American Academy, September); T. W. Page, *The Real Judge Lynch* (Atlantic Monthly, December).

